DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 164 983 08 CE 019 635

AUTHOR Hoyt, Kenneth B.; And Others
TITLE Career Education and Organized Labor. Monographs on Career Education.
INSTITUTION Office of Career Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 97p.; Not available in hard copy due to light and small print in the original document
AVAILABLE FROM Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (Stock Number 017-080-01945-1)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Education; *Cooperative Planning; Educational Objectives; *Labor Education; *Labor Unions; Policy; Program Improvement; Program Planning; Relevance (Education); School Community Relationship; *Work Experience Programs
IDENTIFIERS School to Work Transition

ABSTRACT

The three papers compiled here provide educators and others involved in career education with some information regarding the relationship of career education and organized labor. The first paper, a conference speech by Peter A. Bommarito, President of the United Rubber Workers, presents an official policy statement on career education from the rubber, cork, linoleum and plastic workers. The second paper, by Dr. Mark Schulman of Antioch College, comprises one-half of this monograph and covers the problems organized labor faces with respect to career education. The content of this paper is in three parts. The first part discusses the issues regarding the relationship between career education and labor and includes theoretical, conceptual, and operational considerations; the second part explores the short- and long-range implications of strategies to consolidate or modify labor participation in career education; and the last part offers tentative conclusions and summarizes the paper's content. The third paper, by Kenneth Hoyt, Director of the Office of Career Education, presents the views expressed by members of organized labor at a seminar dealing with the role and function of organized labor in the career education effort. His paper focuses on seven topics, some of which are the following: the kinds of career education activities in which organized labor should participate; how the K-12 school system should obtain resource persons from organized labor; organized labor representation on community career education action councils; and involving organized labor on career education field trips. (EM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED164983

MONOGRAPHS ON CAREER EDUCATION

CAREER EDUCATION AND ORGANIZED LABOR

by

Kenneth B. Hoyt, *Director*
Office of Career Education
Office of Education

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CE 019 635

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Joseph A. Califano, Jr., *Secretary*
Mary F. Berry, *Assistant Secretary for Education*

Office of Education
Ernest L. Boyer, *Commissioner*

Foreword

The American Labor Movement is inextricably bound to the positive advancement of the concept of career education. Since the Federal effort to address this question was first articulated by Dr. Sidney P. Marland, Labor has expressed the view that young people must learn about the real world of work.

Between then and now, something got lost in the translation between educators and Labor leaders. First there was the astonishing position, held by some, that the idea could be imposed by the government so long as it was blessed by the business community. These included, from hands-on experience schemes at zero pay for students actually involved in the production process, to sub-minimum wages, to the relaxation of child labor laws and on and on. Indeed, no proposals were put forth in the early days which paid any attention to National and Local economics. Nor was thought given to the levels of unemployment and the competence of career guidance counselors to properly lead secondary school students to entry-level slots in meaningful careers.

Few career education planners took a real world look at the labor force statistics, or they chose to ignore them. They did not see that as the American Labor force grows, it becomes more feminine. Increasing numbers of women have moved into *paid* work and now show up in labor force statistics. We are told that by 1985 the rate of women entering the labor force will exceed the rate of men.

The unemployment rate for young Americans, particularly black youth, is an embarrassment to the United States. These are fellow citizens in the work force actually seeking work.

The early reservations of trade unions about career education can be found within this context.

I am now pleased to assert that labor's message about this state of affairs has finally pierced the granite wall of misunderstanding among career education advocates.

While we move on with preparing young people for promising careers, we must also press for a full employment economy. Moreover, full recognition to the various forces at work in our society to negate future career opportunities, must somehow reach policymakers to avoid wheel-spinning efforts, counter-productive to National goals.

We must recognize the revolution in technology--none of which is labor intensive, global economic arrangements with developing countries which reduce or eliminate American careers, efforts by the multi-national corporations to export American jobs and the energy-raw material issues facing America's future.

All of these potential problem areas are solvable if due recognition and concern is given to the future of the American work force.

This tract on unions and career education represents the first real step toward narrowing the polarization between labor, government, and educators which has effectively blocked progress in this field.

Mr. Peter A. Bommarito, President of the United Rubber Workers, eloquently makes the case in his address to the 1976 National Conference on Career Education in Houston, Texas. Referring to youth unemployment, he said, "High unemployment among young people is not the fault of our education system, nor is it the responsibility of the educational system to solve it." The implications are many, but essentially this comment served to signal career educators that they were entering upon new turf already occupied by labor, business, and government.

Mark Schulman's contribution is basic to bringing the parties to the starting line on an equal footing. His liberal quotes from my former associate and friend, John Sessions, gives needed credibility for trade unionists to his research.

Finally, Dr. Kenneth B. Hoyt, who bears the scars of the great warrior who refused to give up against recalcitrants to his dream of an effective career education program for this nation, can say with pride, "I now have the pieces together."

Walter G. Davis
Director of Education
AFL/CIO

Preface

The three papers which have been combined to form this monograph each approach the topic of "career education and organized labor" from a different perspective. They are placed together here in order to bring a more concentrated focus to this very important topic. Their ordering in this monograph has been purposeful.

The first paper is a speech presented by Mr. Peter A. Bommarito, President, United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, and Plastic Workers of America. This speech, delivered at the Commissioner's National Conference On Career Education held in November, 1976 at Houston, Texas, was the major policy program for organized labor at the Conference. It should be viewed as an official policy document from a major segment of the American labor movement.

The paper written by Dr. Mark Schulman is one prepared under contract with the National Advisory Council on Career Education. It is a thoughtful, scholarly study of the problems organized labor faces with respect to career education. Based on extensive study and data collection from both career education leaders and leaders in the organized labor movement, it is probably the most comprehensive and best documented statement on the topic yet produced. It is a scholarly piece written by a scholar.

The third paper, unlike the other two, is neither an official policy statement nor a scholarly review of the literature. Instead, it consists simply of a narrative summary of ideas, opinions, and suggestions for better and more effective involvement of organized labor in the career education effort.

Because these ideas came from professional persons who themselves are involved in labor/career education relationships as representatives of organized labor, it is hoped that their thoughts, too, will be of some interest to educators and others involved in career education.

Kenneth B. Hoyt
Director, Office of Career Education
U.S. Office of Education

SPEECH BY PETER A. BOMMARITO TO

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON CAREER EDUCATION

Houston, Texas

November 9, 1976

Mr. Commissioner, Mr. Terrell, distinguished guests on the dais, friends and colleagues, it is indeed an honor to be here among so many distinguished educators as a representative of organized labor. It is also stimulating to participate in a dialogue on career education, a developing concept in which labor can play a valuable and constructive role.

Let me say at the outset that we in labor strongly endorse the concept of career awareness coupled with expanded career choices and a sound academic background for all children in America.

We have no problem with the concept, but we do have problems with some of the ways in which this concept has been interpreted. We hope that recent invitations to participate in planning and implementing career education programs are indeed *that*, and not merely an effort to secure our seal of approval. If the invitation is sincere, I am sure that a continuing dialogue can resolve many of those problems.

There is, or should be, a natural alliance between organized labor and public education. It is, after all, primarily children of working people who utilize the system, and it was organized labor that fought so hard in the last century to make first class, free public education available to all as a matter of right. And labor remains the most consistent and effective support for public funds for education.

So—whatever the state of the art today—for better or for worse—we have been partners in building the system which employs most of you; and directly or indirectly, several million more. It is time that we recognize this partnership and build upon it. Sadly, we all know that this has not been the case in the past.

For too long labor has been made to stand outside the doors while critical decisions affecting our children were made inside. For too long public education and teacher training institutions have ignored the positive potential of labor input in the schools.

For too long "community resources" has meant every resource except labor. Sometimes these attitudes are rationalized by labelling us "anti-intellectual." My friends, that is a myth, but a myth carefully nurtured by those who would rather label us than deal with us.

These unfortunate problems have not turned us off or turned us away from a willingness to provide support and assistance when it is sought for a program we see as valuable.

Last year in Akron, where URW International Headquarters are located, we endorsed a joint application by the school board and the Akron Regional Board of Development for an HEW grant to further the career education program in our Akron schools. We did so because we felt, and still do, that our input as well as our endorsement was being sought.

The grant was received and it is hoped that Akron's program will serve as a model of school and community effort. We in labor in Akron are setting up a structure for a cooperative effort which we are sure can enhance the value of the program. We are prepared to provide speakers and materials; exposure to union operations and union families; teaching units on labor's role in our society; involvement in teacher workshops as well as active participation on advisory committees. This we offer and more, while noting that Akron is now in its sixth year of a career education program and wondering why our input was not sought in the first five years. We can only assume that the current activity reflects a recognition of labor and not a recognition of "guidelines." We also note that this experience is somewhat unique and not typical of our experience in most other parts of the country.

If our approach seems overly cautious in an area of obvious concern, it may help to recall the circumstances of the birth of career education as a federally endorsed program.

Career education began to take shape in the early Nixon years when Spiro Agnew rediscovered the "natural aristocracy of intellect" and suggested that there were too many students in colleges and universities who would be better off in vocational education. It has always been our contention that there are too many young people *not* in college because they cannot afford the cost.

In any event, Dr. Sidney P. Marland, then U.S. Commissioner of Education, announced his career education plans here in Houston in January 1971. Later that year he negotiated the use of discretionary vocational education funds with State superintendents in order to get career education off the ground.

Our critical approach in those first years was not just because it was a Nixon/Agnew program - although I cannot now think of a single Nixon/Agnew program that had any concern for Labor's interests - nor because it was a Marland program - and we had ample experience with his pro-business bias. If Dr. Marland's years in school administration were not conclusive, I would point to his devoting 22 pages in his book *Career Education* to the proposals of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce while barely mentioning the position of labor.

Soon the "Coleman II" report and the Kettering report followed by an NEA industry forum and speeches and articles by B. Frank Brown developed a

picture of career education which alarmed us. Career education was becoming a vehicle for the return to child labor at substandard wages with industry and schools cooperating to solve youthful unemployment by channeling youngsters away from academics and into work experience and jobs at an early age.

We heard, and still hear from some, that children should be encouraged to leave school early and that child labor and minimum wage laws ought to be revised. It has been and will remain our position that education must do more than make children job ready with marketable skills at the end of high school.

Spiro Agnew notwithstanding, the arts and humanities are not and ought not be the special province of the privileged. A liberal education *is* relevant to a full and enlightened participation in our society regardless of the skills required to earn a paycheck.

In 1934 Franklin D. Roosevelt said, "The necessities of our time demand that men avoid being set in grooves, that they avoid the occupational predestination of the older world, and that in the face of the change and development in America, they must have a sufficiently broad and comprehensive conception of the world in which they live, to meet its changing problems with resourcefulness and practical vision. There is in the spirit of a liberal education something of a self-confidence and the adaptability that is characteristic of our country. The pioneer does not call his life a failure if he comes to the end of one path. He knows that there are others, and with a sense of direction and a will to preserve, his life can go on with confidence into the uncertainties of the future." The passage of 42 years has not eroded the wisdom of that message.

The job market continues to move in the direction of demanding more sophistication and more education, not less.

A stationary engineer is not a janitor in the old sense and can hardly repair a modern boiler or air conditioning system without considerable command of language and mathematical skills.

If we begin to impose career choices at too early an age and teach only so-called "relevant" skills, we will indeed realize Agnew's "aristocracy" and create in America a class system which is contrary to everything we believe about our great nation. Abraham Lincoln recognized this problem in discussing labor and education many years ago.

He said "By the mud-still theory it is assumed that labor and education are incompatible, and any practical combination of them impossible. According to that theory, the education of laborers is not only useless but pernicious and dangerous. Free labor, on the other hand, demands universal education and they have much the better of argument."

Career education can and should be an operating philosophy within our schools which helps *all* children become aware of the world of work in a way which broadens rather than limits their choices. It can and should help young people become aware of the world as it is as well as the way we would like it to be. It can and should be a way of bringing the community into the classroom and the student into the community. It can and should help provide options and flexibility in career choices.

It cannot and should not be a new way to return to an old world of occupational predestination. It cannot and should not be an answer to youthful unemployment. That is not a problem stemming from the relevance of general education but rather a problem of an economy which does not provide enough jobs.

It cannot, and should not, be a way of turning over public education responsibilities to any private sector. My indication is that industry does not want that burden any more than we want them to have it.

It cannot, and should not, be a way to subvert child labor laws or minimum wage laws or to replace semi-skilled adults with under-paid youngsters. It cannot, and should not, become a European style method of imposing job choices at too early an age, where young people are locked into occupations they may wish to, or have to, leave only to then find they have insufficient general education for flexibility in choosing alternatives.

Too often I have heard career education described with an orientation toward blue collar and entry-level training. When this question is raised the response is often the magic "career ladder" idea of upward movement.

How many nurses aides do you know who have become brain surgeons? Perhaps more relevant to this audience, how many teachers aides do you know who have been offered the opportunity, let alone become certified teachers?

If career education is a way to make the world more real to students, then we are for it. If career education is a way to provide less education, then we are opposed to it.

In 1961, President Kennedy, facing unemployment problems similar to those we face now, urged the nation's youth to stay in school. He recognized the problems of the dropout and the problems of the semi-skilled in a changing job market. He was right in 1961 and we should give our youth the same advice today. We need more education, not less.

My advice to you is twofold. First, beware of those who would have you assume responsibilities which are not properly yours. High unemployment among young people is not the fault of our educational system, nor is it the responsibility of the educational system to solve it.

Secondly, invite us into your classrooms and workshops. Most of you pay dues to a union or association and so will most of your students. Whether they work in a plant, build houses, fly jet aircraft, teach or perform surgery, they will find it expedient or necessary to join unions and associations which promote their common interests.

We can add some realism to the discussion of labor's role in building our democracy and we can speak from experience about the world of work our young people will enter. Wages, job security, fringes, advancement, continuing education are all related to the goals and activities of unions as well as to the needs of our children.

Attendance at this conference, pending legislation and mushrooming programs indicate that career education is real. The concept has great potential but it will need broad community acceptance and support—including that of labor—if it is to flourish.

We do not view career education as a panacea but rather as an enrichment of a system designed to ever widen the horizons of all Americans.

I am reminded that labor is often associated with "cradle-to-grave" care for its members. That view is frequently distorted, but in the case of education it is 100 percent accurate. Thus career education beginning with early awareness can be an important part of our program, but we will continue to support vocational education, apprenticeship training, continuing adult education in general studies, labor studies skill training, as well as the humanities, arts and professions.

To reiterate; we will support early awareness of careers and the world of work along with greater community involvement, but we will not support choices made too early which tend to be limiting and result in early termination of general education.

We look forward with enthusiasm to our participation in Akron's model program. We hope that the results will be useful for all of you.

We will continue to support quality education including career education as long as it is in tune with our vision of an America in which all children can truly become all that they are capable of becoming.

ISSUES AND STRATEGIES FOR ENHANCING THE PARTICIPATION OF LABOR IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF CAREER EDUCATION

Mark Schulman
Antioch College

This short paper, I will admit at the outset, raises many more questions than it can resolve.

The research which it represents was undertaken to suggest potential solutions to the problems implicit in the following statement of the "Scope of Work:"

1. Contact major organized labor sources to assess the problems and possibilities of interrelationships between unions and schools in implementing the concept of career education.

2. Review the literature (both statements by unions and articles by educators) on the participation of labor in the implementation of career education.

   a. The effect of images of work in the school and curriculum and in other educational sources on young people's perceptions of unions and their own careers.

   b. The conflicts and compatibilities in the current concept of career education and organized labor's viewpoints.

   c. The pros and cons of work experience, considering the potential of various forms of paid and unpaid work experience and the question of the relationship between student workers and unemployment.

   d. The viewpoints of education and labor leaders of the transition between education and work and how the concept of career education relates to that area.

4. Write a summary as part of the paper which identifies and recommends strategies for enhancing the participation of labor in the implementation of career education.

Though I am not apologetic for the results I have managed under the usual constraints all researchers cite (time, money and people-power), I must now agree with one of my correspondents, who wrote:

> First of all, in reviewing the "Scope of Work" statement you sent, I am in awe at the size of the topic you are to address. Any one of the issues would have been sufficient for a paper. Good luck to you.

Yes, any one issue would have been sufficient, but yes, too, I have had good luck—in being able to contact approachable and thoughtful people in the labor

movement and among educators who have been invaluable in their aid. While acknowledging their factual and critical assistance, it must be made clear that the interpretive and evaluative analysis of this material is my own. Therefore, any errors—and, given the size of the topic, there are undoubtedly some—are entirely my own.

The procedure followed in the development of this paper corresponded to the outline suggested in the Statement of Work.

In July and August 1976, I made contact with as many labor unions and other labor organizations as possible. Of approximately one-hundred unions that I have approached, more than 25 percent have responded with specific information by this date—and material continues to arrive.

During August and September 1976, I followed up on initial contacts with individuals in the labor movement and searched the recent literature of career education for relevant portions. In addition, I established contact with several educators to take advantage of their conceptual expertise and knowledge of specific developments.

By the first week of October 1976, a draft of this paper was circulated to a selected list of correspondents. Their comments and suggestions are incorporated in the final version submitted to the National Advisory Council on Career Education.

I do not desire to slight any of the people who have been helpful to me in this project by omitting their names from an attempt at a comprehensive list. I must, however, cite several sources without whom this paper would not have been possible—though I am making no attempt at comprehensiveness. Among those sources are Kenneth R. Edwards, Al Lorente, Calvin M. McIntyre, Horst Reschke, John A. Sessions, Gus Tyler, William E. Weisgerber.

Even in its "finished" draft, this remains little more than an annotated outline on this topic. It provides, I hope, directions and insights which may be followed up by others and in my own subsequent research. If, by raising questions and pointing toward tentative solutions, I am able to encourage further probing, then I have been successful.

As an overview to the subject of this paper, we need to keep in mind an explanatory caution, a fundamental issue, and a primary question.

A CAUTION

First, the caution:

The title of this paper implies that we are discussing "labor" and "career education." This is in actuality only partially correct.

Given the reality of locating and querying spokespersons for those spheres of endeavor, the inclination is to seek out the people and organizations which have been most articulate on the issues. In the case of "labor," this proves to be the trade union movement, and, more particularly, certain entities within that movement (e.g., the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations—AFL-CIO—and the International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America—UAW).

In the case of career education, the most prominent informational source is (and has been since the establishment of the Office of Career Education, if not before) the United States Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (OE). Specifically certain individuals associated (now or in the past) with OE such as Sidney P. Marland, Jr. and Kenneth B. Hoyt—have been among the movement's most prominent spokespersons.

The *caveat*, of course, is to keep in mind that unions do not speak for *all* workers and that OE does not speak for *all* educators. Basic statistics indicate the reality of the situation. In recent years only about one-fourth of the labor force has belonged to unions; unorganized workers by the nature of their circumstance have little input to the career education discussion. And there are thousands of separate and, to one degree or another, autonomous school districts in the United States, each modifying to local conditions their interpretations of career education concepts.

It is true, however, that organized labor's self-construed primary role is to articulate the needs of people-as-workers. This does not exclude, of course, their other roles, but it is most important to note that, in the absence of any other association of people-as-workers within the social framework, organized labor is the only recognizable entity to speak for that group as a collectivity. Indeed, this should not be read to imply a negative stance toward trade unions as they perform this function; in most instances, they do this job well (perhaps too well, according to their critics).

With OE there is even firmer ground for accepting its role as articulator of the career education concept even if other conceptual frameworks are available.[1] For the five years this approach to educational reform has been undergoing clarification, OE and its leadership have taken the commendable ideological position that, for reform to truly "take hold," it cannot be imposed from above. This stance has led to a surprising degree of consensus among career educators on definitional aspects of the concept, demonstrated primarily in the OE policy paper, *An Introduction to Career Education*, to which we will often refer.

Delving into the realm of ideology brings us face to face with the fundamental issue mentioned previously. Fundamental to any discussion is the issue of the relationship of school and society. What must ultimately be determined is the nature of the society itself, which in turn defines the nature of the schools which serve its needs.

THE ISSUE

It is clearly beyond the scope of this paper to address this issue in any but the most peripheral manner. And since there will be some further discussion apropos the topic (particularly in the conclusion), we will leave it at this point—except for one addition.

Career educators preach reform of the educational system and quote with approbation the contemporary critics of the formal educational process—Holt, Kozol, Silberman, et al.; even Illich in some cases. In their approach they value a totally transformed school and depend upon the cooperation—even more than that, the *collaboration*—of all the diverse elements in the society to work toward the common goal, defined as career education for all.

But trade unionists are ideologically divergent from this goal in at least one important respect: their realization that *conflict*, not consensus, is the reality beneath the interaction between labor and management on several important specific issues (such as wage policies and workplace priorities). As will be discussed later, this recognition has specific consequences in the implementation of career education. At this point it is sufficient to note the general consequence only: a mutual suspicion between labor leaders and educators of the reality behind each other's rhetoric. One possible cause for this attitude that goes beyond rhetoric is the actual *roles* of the parties involved. As *worker's* representatives, union leaders share a *labor* perspective. But since many career education spokespersons are *administrators* in their school systems, they often agree with *management* assumptions.

This situation appears to be changing through an ongoing process of evolution and development and at present many educator/labor leader differences are being resolved. It is important not to disregard this area as a real and potential clash of ideologies and interests, nevertheless.

A QUESTION

This issue indicates what must be stated as the primary question of this research. It is implicit, in fact, in all educational research.

Stated simply, it is this: to achieve the humanistic goals proposed by the proponents of career education, how adequate is the educational reform they suggest? To put it another way: granted that the comprehensive transformation of the schools (advocated in the career education concept) is *not* proposed as

the only element in profound social change, nevertheless how *close* or how *far* is it from the mark? After career education, what happens next? Or, in reality, will conditions remain basically the same? We will return to this question in the conclusion.

ORGANIZATION OF PAPER

The sections which follow approach the relationship between career education and labor in two distinct ways. The first is the *issues* behind the relationship. Each of three subdivisions of this section deals with a *level* of appropriate considerations: first the *theoretical*, then the *conceptual*, and last the *operational*.

Following the issue considerations are two sections on *strategies* to consolidate and/or modify the "action plan" of labor participation in career education. The first subdividion treats the subject of the short-range *implementation* suggestions; the second, the topic of long-range *implications*.

In the concluding section, the issues and strategies are pulled together in an assessment of the future prospects of career education, in relation to past realities and present possibilities.

One additional note on organization: the reader may peruse the first half of this paper with an increasing level of pessimism and negative feelings about the possibility of constructive interrelationships between career education and organized labor. This would be a fallacious perception for at least two reasons:

First, the paper attempts through its documentation to supply a sense of the evolution of the issues over a fixed time period. Thus, while it is not a strict chronological order, the quotations tend to stress more antagonistic relations and less coherent and developed formulations (by both labor leaders and educators) in the "early years." Since "early years" quotations predominate in the first sections, there is a somewhat misleading skew toward antipathy.

Secondly, and more importantly, the attitudes and conceptual framework is changing very rapidly. Literally in the last few months (and even weeks and days) new developments and outlooks have been increasing the degree of common interest between labor and career education. As with any project which attempts to chronicle a dynamic process, the setting down on static pages of the description renders the analysis obsolete before its time.

The careful reader, then, must suspend judgement until the end of these pages—and, even then, must temper any conclusions—this paper's or his/her own—with the fresh evidence of fast-moving events.

PART I—ISSUES

Theoretical Considerations

As in no other period of human history, we are living in a world of rapid change. The knowledge and skills that we acquired in schools are obsolete today for our children, and they must be updated to be useful in our own lives. Advanced technology has revolutionized all aspects of modern society. Some of the most extensive changes have been in the world of work and in the changing patterns of our lives.

We have been told frequently that a young person entering the world of work today must face the possibility of changing occupations and jobs several times in his life, because the career for which he has prepared himself has become obsolete. This has immediate implications for education.

This would seem to dictate that an education system that trains students narrowly for specific jobs will fail in its purpose. The development of specific technical skills is not the fundamental purpose of education. In today's world, when skills are becoming so rapidly outmoded, the acquisition of such skills is even less meaningful.

Education embraces, but is much more than job-training. Education must prepare students to become constructive human beings, teach them how to become intelligent consumers, teach them how society operates and how to participate intelligently in its operation. It must teach them how to adapt to change so as to enrich the quality of their lives. It must teach them how to learn.

Vocational education has been looked on as the way society separates those who are college-bound from those whose fate it is to wind up in the factories. What is learned in these programs bears too little relationship to the world of work as a whole, nor does it prepare the students to function productively in a society in the broader sense of full participation as a citizen.

The latest catch word on the education scene is "career education." It is not clear as yet whether the concept of career education will be a passing fad in a long list of educational panaceas. If it is not to wind up on the scrap heap of discarded ideas, it should relate career alternatives to the ongoing changes in our society and offer the student realistic options.

Moreover, how realistic are career options with an administration in Washington willing to consider our economy operating at full employment when over five percent of our work force (10 percent in Michigan) is unemployed? It seems clear that career options and career education can only become meaningful when there are jobs available for everyone seeking work.

If career education is viewed as a means of restoring the so-called "work ethic," this attempt, too, will not succeed. There is no "dignity of labor" where the work is on dead end, dull, repetitive, meaningless jobs. Workers need no catch phrases to understand how to bring dignity to the workplace. They do so when they join unions so they can participate in decision-making affecting their welfare at the work place.

—From the "Resolution on Public Education" adopted at the UAW 24th Constitutional Convention, 1974.[2]

At the most abstract theoretical level, unions and educators must reach an agreement (or at least agree to disagree) before organized labor will accept a substantive role in the implementation of career education. Even before discussing the definitions of such words as "work" and "education" as *concepts*, we must have tentative agreement about a theoretical basis for relating education and the world of work.

Theories of work and labor are many, as are theories of education and learning. This section briefly outlines a theory of work common to both career education and labor, comments on the educational aspects of social institutions *other than* the school, and raises some questions regarding the "extensive changes. . . in the world of work and in the changing patterns of our lives."

A THEORY OF WORK

After outlining the historical development of work—through Luther, Freud, Marx, and so on—the HEW task force which produced the monumental study *Work in America* correctly asserts that "work responds to something profound and basic in human nature."[3] They then proceed to offer a "multi-dimensional definition" of work: "an activity that produces something of value for other people."[4] Such a definition is expanded on by the OE definition discussed later. But we cite it here because of the explicit theoretical assumption behind the definition: that in its broadest sense work *qua* work is valuable for the individual.

This is, in fact, a *hypothesis* concerning the nature of work rather than a scientific fact. In the reality of their lives many workers seem to find the

notion that their activity called "work" is valuably a mockery of their own perceptions. They know, in their bones, what Studs Terkel alleges in *Working:*

> This book, being about work, is, by its very nature, about violence–to the spirit as well as to the body. It is about ulcers as well as accidents, about shouting matches as well as fist fights, about nervous breakdowns as well as kicking the dog around. It is, above all (or beneath all), about daily humiliations. To survive the day is triumph for the walking wounded among the great many of us.[5]

If the direct evidence of most people's lives contradicts the theoretical assertions of a conceptualizer, either a) "most people" are confused about their lives, or b) the conceptualizer doesn't know what he or she is talking about. In relation to a theory of work, we arrive at our first complication: career education proponents opt for explanation "a," while labor leaders often choose explanation "b."

Hoyt, for example, has written and lectured many times about this question.[6] His point of view is that the dull and meaningless activity most people call "work" should actually be called "labor," and differentiated from the meaningful, satisfying, and productive activity that is "work."[7] Disregarding for the moment the unfortunate consequences of redefining labor in a way certain to alienate *labor* leaders, the progression from this point of view to the conceptual framework of career education is logical and positive.

But what if the educators are wrong? What if, instead, John A. Sessions has come closer to the reality of the matter, as when he argues in a March 1974, *AFL-CIO American Federationist* article "Misdirecting Career Education:"

> . . .Writing about career education and the world of work from the outside looking in has its advantages and its disadvantages. The book [OE's *Essays in Career Education*] says much about what career education can do to restore "the work ethic" and the "dignity of labor." This is an outsiders misunderstanding about what work is all about. Most workers do not work because they think it is the ethical thing to do but because their families will go hungry if they don't. . . .
>
> Workers are fully aware that their jobs frequently involve indignities and that is why they form unions. If there is dignity in labor, it is usually not a natural state of affairs but rather the result of unions through which workers have brought a measure of dignity to their jobs.[8]

Sessions, an assistant director in the AFL-CIO education department, speaks for many in organized labor. Labor consistently questions whether educators

understand what they are talking about when they describe work. The dispute goes beyond amiable definitional discussion; it is, in fact, in the realm of serious philosophical argumentation.

EXPANDING EDUCATIONAL THEORY

Labor organizations have raised questions, too, about the *educational* theory which informs the career education perspective. Most of these questions have been raised before and cannot be called "resolved." They for the most part fall into the "general categories of disagreement" Marland elucidates in *Career Education: A Proposal for Reform:*

1. Career education is anti-intellectual.

2. The concept is too fuzzy and ill-defined.

3. Blacks and other minorities are threatened by what might be called "tracking."

4. Young children are not ready to "decide" about their careers.

5. Career education's solely concerned with getting jobs and filling manpower needs in a capitalist system.

6. The colleges and universities are already threatened with a lowering or a leveling-off of enrollments-career education may aggravate the problem.

7. Career education programs are "taking money away" from vocational education programs.

8. The unpredictability of the manpower needs of this country makes career education a "futile exercise."

9. Career education is a device for perpetuating a "corporate social order," reinforcing big business and productivity, as distinct from values related to human services.

10. The concept appears to perpetuate the stereotyping of occupations by sex, and gives insufficient attention to women in occupations.[9]

Many of these disagreements will surface in subsequent pages as we look at conceptual and operational considerations.

Most of them relate to the educational theory of formal schooling.

The labor movement does not, in general, believe that career education has provided satisfactory answers.

But we must move away from the institution of the formal school to consider another, less acknowledged, aspect of the educational theory problem. OE has recognized that education takes place outside the school both in their conceptual definitions and their career education models.[10] When one looks at the reality of these other forms of education, other problems emerge in relating learning and the world of work.

Though they clearly fit our definition, we will not consider here the family-home, or the church, or community institutions, as educational agencies which may effect learning about careers. But we must consider in brief one educator, for we would commit grave errors of interpretation if we were to ignore it. We refer, of course, to the mass media, particularly television.

Research has demonstrated the importance of the media in the education of youth.[11] While it is true that little is known conclusively about the *effects* of media on people, we do know that, statistically at least, the influence must be overwhelming: the percentage of homes with TV sets nears 100 percent; young people have spent more hours in front of television than in school by age 18; each person averages six hours a day watching television; and so on.

Consequently, the image of work, workers and unions becomes a theoretical concern for career educators. Little research is available in this area; what exists demonstrates how media distort occupational information.

Work in America, for example, discusses "Society's View of the Manual Worker:"

> We must also recognize that manual work has become increasingly denigrated by the upper middle class of this nation. The problems of self-esteem inherent in these changing attitudes are further compounded by the impact of the communications media. For example, the images of blue-collar workers that are presented by the media (including school textbooks) are often negative. Workers are presented as "hard hats" (racists or authoritarians) or as "fat cats" (lazy plumbers who work only twenty-hours a week yet earn $400.00). The view of the worker in the mass media is that he is the problem, not that he *has* problems.

Today, there is virtually no accurate dramatic representation—as there was in the 1930's—of men and women in working-class occupations. Instead, we have recently had the movie "Joe" and the television series about Archie Bunker (All in the Family). These stereotypes—ignoring the

heterogeneity of blue-collar workers–do little to enhance the dignity of the worker or his job. For example, what does Archie do on the job? Is he ashamed of his job? Is that why he won't talk about it at home? Certainly, if he worked in an office we would see scenes of him at work. The negative view of all blue-collar work in the show is reinforced by the fact that Archie's "socially enlightened" son-in-law is a future professional.

Research shows that one character in ten on television is a blue-collar worker, and these few are usually portrayed as crude people with undesirable social traits. Furthermore, portrayals tend to emphasize class stereotypes: Lawyers are clever while construction workers are louts. But it is not only the self-image of the workers that is being affected; television is conveying to children superficial and misleading information about work in society. If children do, indeed, learn from television they will "learn" that professionals lead lives of carefree leisure, interspersed with drama and excitement (never hard work) and that blue-collar workers are racist clods who use bad grammar and produce little of use for society.[12]

Parenthetically, it is a useful categorization these authors make to include "school textbooks" among the means of mass communication. Indeed, dealing with textbooks raises additional questions regarding images of labor and labor history. Paul Lauter and Florence Howe cite one example in *The Conspiracy of the Young*:

At the same time, textbooks ignore or distort class conflicts in American society. A friend born and raised on the West Coast told us that when he first visited Chicago he was eager to see Haymarket Square, because it had been prominent in the city's early labor struggles about which he had read in a novel. He asked his host, a high-school aged cousin from a working-class family, if he could show him how to get to the Square. The response was, "What do you want to go there for? There's nothing but some restaurants and old stores." The cousin had never read in his Chicago school texts of the Haymarket trial, the McCormick strike, the Knights of Labor, nor of Governor Altgeld. Which is not surprising: the 1962 edition of *The Story of the American Nation* devotes four paragraphs to the DEW (Distant Early Warning) Line but never mentions Eugene Debs or Norman Thomas, let alone A. J. Muste. Another text mentions the 1937 sit-down strikes, but tells neither their location nor their connection with the automobile industry. Just as black people have, on the whole, been deprived of their past, so young working-class men and women have no conceptions even of those events of the last hundred years that have helped determine how they lived, and where.[13]

There are additional misrepresentations that afflict every medium and go beyond labor's image and encourage inequality in career choice. Blacks and other minorities have been victimized by institutional racism in this area as in others; women are victims of sexist socialization. Tentative evidence does not indicate that career education is correcting these flaws–see, for example, "Help Wanted: Sexism in Career Education Materials," produced by Women on Words and Images.[14]

The world, then, of the media is not a world that corresponds to reality. George Gerbner and Larry Gross sketch the occupational aspects of that world in the realm of television drama in their article "Living With Television: The Violence Profile" (*Journal of Communication*, Spring 1976):

> Approximately five in ten characters can be unambiguously identified as gainfully employed. Of these, three are proprietors, managers, and professionals, the fourth comes from the ranks of labor–including all those employed in factories, farms, offices, shops, stores, mining, transportation, service stations, restaurants, and households, and working in unskilled, skilled, clerical, sales, and domestic service capacities. The fifth serves to enforce the law or preserve the peace on behalf of public or private clients.
>
> Types of activities–paid and unpaid–also reflect dramatic and social purposes. Six in ten characters are engaged in discernible occupational activity and can be roughly divided into three groups of two each. The first group represents the world of legitimate private business, industry, agriculture, finance, etc. The second group is engaged in activity related to art, science, religion, health, education, and welfare, as professionals, amateurs, patients, students, or clients. The third makes up the forces of official or semi-official authority and the army of criminals, outlaws, spies, and other enemies arrayed against them. One in every four leading characters acts out a drama of some sort of transgression and its suppression at home and abroad.[15]

This is, obviously, a gross distortion of the occupational structure of the United States in the mid-70's. Note, for example–both in the research and anecdotal evidence–the lack of union members on television. Where is the one in four workers who are organized? When unions *are* represented, it is usually a negative portrayal–the recent popular example is Tom Hartman's battle with corrupt union officials in *Mary Hartman, Mary Hartman.* Such distortions have not gone unnoticed by labor. As one president of an international union wrote to the author recently,

> The University faculty members [and, by extension, all educators] having had no instruction in this extremely significant aspect of American life, do

not understand the fundamental aspects of the labor movement. They tend to reflect the prejudices and misconceptions acquired by reading the capitalistic-dominated press and listening to the management-oriented television newscasts.[16]

Though an assessment of the negative effects of the image of work and workers in the media is not complete, it is clear that career educators must understand and attend to the media's educational function if reform is to be achieved. In other words, the effects must go beyond the school to have broad impact.

TRANSITION FROM EDUCATION TO WORK

A focus of career education theory which is of special interest to labor because of the potential impact is the area of the transition from education to work. Primarily because much remains to be reconciled in the theoretical issues about the nature of education and the nature of work among labor leaders and career educators, the education/work transition presents potential contention, too.

Career education proponents have articulated their viewpoint of this transition in virtually every phase of their documents on their reforms. Organized labor has been less concerned with the specific *transition* phase. For obvious reasons (their purposes and clientele), trade unions have focused on public education's impact on *future* workers and on humanizing the workplace for *current* workers, through both collective bargaining (where in effect) and "organizing the unorganized." Of course, there will need to be an attempt to initiate discussion with labor organizations on this issue, since career education must rely on cooperative efforts to define, facilitate, and implement the transition.

We will consider specific possibilities, such as the role of union education departments in lifelong learning, later in this paper. To conclude this section, it seems appropriate to quote two labor spokesmen deeply concerned with education. In the synthesis of the theoretical issues they raise may lie a meshing of viewpoints between labor and career education on the education/work nexus.

Gus Tyler, assistant president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union (ILGWU) raises this issue in a different form than Willard Wirtz, president of the National Manpower Institute. This is logical, since Tyler operates in the primary role of union official and Wirtz in the role of manpower conceptualizer. But there are connections between Tyler's myths and Wirtz's strategies. What needs to be analyzed, in a cooperative effort of labor and education, is how much truth there is in Tyler's myths and how

much myth there is in Wirtz's stratagems. Perhaps the current large-scale project of the National Manpower Institute will begin to provide answers to these questions.[17]

Tyler writes in "Career Education and Society's Imperatives," from *Essays on Career Education*:

> But if Career Education is to fulfill it's promise it must first relate careers to what is happening in our society, especially to what is happening in the economy... And so, to demythologize the ambience, it might be well to clear away several widely accepted myths about the economy and education....
>
> *The Automation Myth*... that the coming of automation would bring a workless world: the labor force would shrink, unemployment would rise, and the percentage of the population in the labor market would decline.
>
> *The Male Myth*... that the world of work is no world for women... with some exceptions, vocational (career) education is male oriented...
>
> *The School Myth*... that the place where learning takes place is the school. This myth confuses schooling with education...
>
> *The Educational Myth*... is a spin-off of the school myth. It holds that if you have enough degrees you will make enough money.
>
> *The Training Myth*... that if a young man or woman is trained for a job, he or she will get a job... training people for jobs without the necessary social measures to assure that the jobs are there is to use a myth to delude and ultimately to infuriate credulous people.
>
> *The Specialist Myth*... that the way to get a job is to learn to be an expert at something....
>
> *The Myth Myth*... that the way to solve problems is by perpetrating or perpetuating a myth. It offers concepts not as a guide to action but as a substitute for action... It is this myth that in the past has been responsible for many fads in education....[18]

And Wirtz enunciates "A Strategy for Change" in *The Boundless Resource: A Prospectus for an Education/Work Policy:*

> These things can be done:
>
> Stage One—Enlarging Present Beachheads
>
> Proposal One: That there be established, in at least 25 cities Community Education-Work Councils through which school officials, employers,

members of labor unions, and members of the public engage collaboratively in developing and administering education-work programs. . . .

Proposal Two: That a comprehensive Occupational Outlook and Career Information reporting system be established. . . .

Proposal Three: That it be provided, as a total community undertaking, that all high school and college students receive at least five hours per year of career guidance and counseling from both professionally trained and work- or service-experienced counselors. . . .

Proposal Four: That it be undertaken as a community responsibility to develop and administer programs to familiarize high school youth with work and service, including the provision of opportunity for at least 500 hours of work or service experience. . . .

Proposal Five: That a considered break of one or two years in the formal educational sequence—taken between ages 16 and 20—be recognized and established as a standard optional phase of the youth experience, and that a comprehensive program of Community Internships and Work Apprenticeships be instituted at the local level. . . .

Proposal Six: That a complete inventory be made of the extent and effect of laws, practices, and customs that constrain or otherwise influence people's movement between education and work.

Proposal Seven: That a more effective capacity for integrating education and work policy be developed at the national and State levels. . . .

Proposal Eight: That a new Work Institute be established to stimulate collaborative effort in the private sector to maximize work satisfactions and meaning. . . .

Proposal Nine: That all State statutory and regulatory strictures on uses by adults of elementary and secondary public education facilities be removed or that alternative facilities be provided. . . .

Proposal Ten: That the unemployment insurance laws and regulations be revised to permit and encourage the use of periods of unemployment for training and education, and that the "public employment" program concept be revised to include a significant training and education element. . . .

Proposal Eleven: That the present measurements of employment and unemployment (1) be expanded to provide adequate local as well as

national data, (2) be revised to reflect more accurately the varying degrees of "economic hardship" incident to various types of situations, (3) be expanded to cover work and service performed in the home or community but not for pay, and (4) be reported and publicized in a manner differentiating fully between the various groups in the working population. . . .

Stage Two—Interim Objectives

Proposition A: That any adult who has not received 12 years of formal education be entitled to free public education at whatever level is consistent with particular individual circumstance. . . .

Proposition B: That all adults be recognized as entitled to the equivalent of one year's Deferred Educational Opportunity. . . .

Proposition C: That adequate measurements of the development and use of the human resource be made and published as part of a comprehensive set of social indicators. . . .

Proposition D: That there be an increased effort to develop a process for drawing, at the local community level, on the American citizen's authentic desire to participate more fully and directly in the improvement of the human prospect. . . .[19]

Merely setting these outlines down, of course, does not answer the questions posed earlier. Now career education leaders must deal with Tyler's myths directly and labor leaders must criticize Wirtz's proposals and propositions forthrightly. As we shall see in the sections that follow, both groups have already begun that process.

Conceptual Considerations

I would be happy to discuss the relationship of labor to career education. The problem is that career education has been described and programmed in so many different ways that I find it difficult to respond to a nonspecific inquiry.

—Union Education Director,
in response to author's query.[20]

This section relates to the "middle ground" of career education's conceptual framework. "Concept" is, of course, one of those words which one can write a book attempting to define. For the purposes of this paper, however, we use

concept to mean simply the action-oriented, programmatic generalizations developed by the career education movement to explain and to involve the various affected publics.

In that context, we must consider four broad related areas of conflict in organized labor's relation to the career education framework:

A. the clarity of definition (and lack of it)

B. the relation of labor to public education

C. the potential narrowing of choice in career education

D. the possibility of collaborative relationship as envisioned by OE.

THE DEFINITIONAL DILEMMA

What Hoyt has recently called "the definitional dilemma" is probably the most significant conflict area between career educators and labor leaders.[21] In the preceding section we delineated some of the theoretical antipathies relating to theories of education and work. At the conceptual level the debate continues.

"Work" specifically defined is at the crux of the argument. OE's redefinition of work is widely known and highly-regarded among educators, perhaps, but sometimes unknown and disregarded by labor spokespersons.

Contrast, for example, these definitions. The first is from OE's policy statement; the second, William Faulkner (quoted by Studs Terkel in *Working*):

> "Work" is conscious effort, other than that involved in activities whose primary purpose is either coping or relaxation, aimed at producing benefits for oneself and/or for oneself and others.[22]

****

> You can't eat for eight hours a day nor drink for eight hours a day nor make love for eight hours a day—all you can do for eight hours is work. Which is the reason why man makes himself and everybody else so miserable and unhappy.[23]

Granted that Faulkner is more poetic than OE, the fact remains that these concepts of work are almost diametrically opposed.

Hoyt has admitted in recent material that career education's redefinition of work faces a tortuous road to public acceptance. The question, however, is

whether labor organizations will *ever* agree to the distinctions Hoyt proposes.

Will the trade unions accept, for example, the notion that "labor" is "a condition which is disliked, is performed largely only for survival purposes, and which brings little, if any, personal sense of accomplishment or pride to the individual?" What does organized labor gain by accepting Hoyt's characterization of "leisure" as "activities, other than sleeping, in which one engages when not performing in his or her vocation?"[24]

The implications of the definitional dilemma become clearer when the goal of education as *preparation for work* is discussed. Labor has been distrustful of this concept, suspecting that, in actuality, all the distinctions aside, vocational/occupational/career education is merely a disguised form of tracking. This suspicion may be beginning to abate, but a reluctance remains on labor's part to make a wholehearted commitment to career education.

A partial explanation for the hesitation is labor's perception that its people have been unwelcome in the formulation of the definitions (see the next section for specific evidences). Why, they ask, is there no reference to worker organization in OE's ten "Basic Concept Assumptions of Career Education?"[25] If this represents the "philosophical base for current career education efforts," has there been adequate consultation with unions, and does the outcome adequately reflect a labor presence?

Labor, in a word, desires clarification. Many union representatives have read and comprehend the current OE definition:

> "Career education" is the totality of experiences through which one learns about and prepares to engage in work as part of his or her way of living.[26]

But they feel estranged from this conceptualization since it does not clarify some of their perceptions of underlying issues. And since OE's current stance is self-consciously in the liberal humanist tradition, there is all the more reason for labor's concern. For, historically, they feel, humanistic liberal reforms have often been at their constituents' expense with little or no gain.

"The interest of the American labor movement in public education is basic," writes Carroll Hutton, Director of the UAW Education Department. He continues:

LABOR AND PUBLIC EDUCATION

> Throughout its history, organized labor has favored a broad, realistic, and enriched curriculum for public education, and has believed that the gulf between education experiences and life experiences should be narrowed and merged into a unified and meaningful totality.[27]

Hutton is writing in the introduction to a carefully documented and professionally-produced UAW publication entitled "Labor's Historic Support of Public Education: A Chronology." The next 85 pages chronicle that history from 1820 to 1974, interspersed with a compendium of dozens of quotations on the nature of education, ranging from Aristotle to Leonard Woodcock. It is an impressive rendition of a theme that recurs in the labor literature.

Or, as Tyler says in his essay "Career Education and Society's Imperatives,"

> Over these many decades, American labor has continued its original interest in a system of education that would prepare people for a life in the workplace and the community.[28]

Career education's assertion that it sees itself as a movement for total educational reform is viewed by labor, given the aforementioned definitional dilemma, as potentially troublesome. As over 9,000 schools at the elementary and secondary level have adopted some form of career development program—and 3 percent of the systems have enacted comprehensive programs—the labor movement views these developments with apprehension, particularly in the wake of programs allowing the private sector to take control of some elements within the public schools that labor generally opposed, such as performance contracting and voucher plans.

Labor organizations will not support career education unequivocally until the educators can assure them—unequivocally—that the implementation of *perparation for work* concepts does *not* mean the future demise of the public school system.

The AFL-CIO Executive Council in 1972 expressed one form of concern for the "narrowing" effect of career education:

NARROWING OR BROADENING OF CHOICE

> It is difficult to avoid the implication that what is really involved is not so much an upgrading of career education as an effort to find an excuse for less Federal support for higher education. . .
>
> The AFL-CIO supports career education but we will not allow it to be won at the expense of narrowing opportunities for higher education.[29]

This passage refers to the narrowing effect of career education plans on educational *institutions*. A corollary, and perhaps even more strongly held, concern of organized labor—arising out of their perceptions of the long-running controversy over "dual system" education—is the narrowing effect of career education for *individuals*.

"One of the bad tendencies of the career educators," Sessions writes, "is to force young people—directly or indirectly—to make career decisions too early."[30] This statement correlates closely with other critical evaluations of the OE model of career development.

Until the career education movement can produce evidence that their concepts *increase* rather than *decrease* options for students as they advance through the educational system, much of organized labor will remain on the sidelines as interested observers—but not on the field as zealous participants.

This issue seems to be a key point that needs resolution in the career education debate. Sessions has noted that many authors seem "to have read closely some of the labor documents on the subject and decided they share labor's concerns."[31] He goes on to clarify the way that labor has been anxious that—

> career education may treat students as simply future economic producers, rather than flesh and blood people who are workers but who are also consumers, members of family groups, citizens of the community and the world and individuals striving to fulfill the best that is in them.[32]

His assessment that others outside of labor share this view is corroborated by such indications as the following assessment, written by an educator active in career education, in a letter to the author:

> Organized labor because of its hostility to equating a career with an occupation, is one of the strongest forces available to support a broad concept of career education.[33]

BUSINESS LABOR-INDUSTRY COLLABO-RATION

It would appear to be, at the very least, a tactical error to sandwich "Labor" between "Business" and "Industry" in describing that "community." But it is not merely impolite syntax: career educators may be committing a conceptual sin in this construction.

Hoyt has listed at least seven ways in which career education hopes the "business-labor-industry" community will collaborate:

1. Serving as resource persons in classrooms

2. Offering observational work experiences for students and educators

3. Providing knowledge and consultation concerning the nature of work

4. Assist schools to aid students in transition to work roles

5. Humanizing the work environment

6. Encouraging career education in the educational system

7. Helping define and promote productive use of leisure time.[34]

We have indicated on previous pages why some of these goals may be unclear or inadequate to unions. The additional point to stress here is the apparently careless and possibly destructive formulation of business, industry, and labor as bonded together in a community of interest. There are, as noted above, real sources of conflict and antagonism between management and labor. To submerge these differences in a haphazard construct that invites facile statements which do not correspond to social reality is to invite disastrous consequences. Again, a conceptual clarification will be demanded by labor and is very much in order.

It is useful to conclude this section with a methodology similar to the preceding conclusion. That is, a comparison of two divergent lists is helpful to assess where we need to go from here.

For one set we return to the early statement of concepts of Marland's *Career Education.* He presents ten concepts which emerged from the First National Conference on Career Education, sponsored by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. Though Marland asserts that labor had a high degree of participation in the partnership which produced these concepts, it may be more useful to analyze the listing as the "management agenda" for educational reform. The concepts are:

1. Exchange programs between business-labor-industry and school personnel.

2. Field trips for students

3. Work experience for all school students

4. School-industry job placement programs

5. Occupational Resource Persons

6. Year-round school staffed partly by business-labor-industrial personnel

7. Retired workers as resource persons

8. Work as more personally satisfying to the individual worker

9. Every student leaving school equipped with a marketable job skill

10. Every student leaving school able to find work[35]

For comparison (and it is also interesting to contrast the above program with Wirtz and Tyler and what follows) here is an early list of "Questions One Might Ask of Career Education." It was prepared by Kenneth R. Edwards, Director, Skill Improvement Training, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

1. Will Career Education work?

2. Will it supply dignity to the "world of work?"

3. Will our present teachers be capable of teaching the "world of work?"

4. How will teachers gain the actual on-the-job experience needed to make career education work and at whose expense?

5. Can students be taught and will they accept the ethics of work?

6. Can a student make a tentative career choice by the end of kindergarten? Can he make a choice of the career or careers he wishes to explore by the end of the 6th grade? Will he be mature by the 9th grade to actually make a firm choice of an occupation?

7. Will employers, who now require a baccalaureate degree, lower their standards to accept career educated employees?

8. How will present schools meet the needs for career counseling and placement?

9. What will be the overall effect of vocational skill training in a formal education environment?

10. How many workers will be displaced when attempts are made to place teachers and students on jobs to gain work experience?

11. Can parents accept career education as a direct replacement for the time honored dream of a college education for their children and how may parent attitudes be changed?

12. Will the occupational community be used as a source of information or will the educators assume that they know what is best?

13. Who will evaluate career education and serve as a source of observation—the educators, the government, the general public or the occupational community?

14. How will work, itself, be made meaningful to all?

15. Can the organizational and administrative structure of education be changed to accept the full impact of career education?

16. Will the proposed benefits to be gained exceed the cost?

17. Will so much emphasis on the "world of work" tend to lower the intellectual level of this country, making it somewhat backwards?

18. Will career education cause a flood on the labor market of semi-trained persons and in the long-run, reduce wages and working conditions?[36]

Despite any assertions by career educators to the contrary, these questions of the conceptual framework and theoretical bases of career education remain unanswered or only partially answered. Proof of this state of affairs is available in the practical applications of the concepts, the subject of the operational considerations section which follows.

Operational Considerations

> Even accepting for the sake of argument the philosophy of this project, we have grave doubts about its possible implementation. . . . We continue to believe that career education, properly interpreted, has an important place in the reformation of the school curriculum, and that the reformation of that curriculum should be a subject of major attention. We do not wish the school system to clean its house by abandoning it and moving into ours.
>
> —Department of Research & Education
> International Union of Operating Engineers, 1973[37]

There is an organic relationship between the instances of practical application of career education concepts which we examine here and the recommendations for change which follow.

The "heft" of this section, however, may give the delusion that it is of secondary import in comparison to other aspects of this paper. This is illusory. There is a simple explanation for the paucity of examples of interaction, best phrased by an educator who wrote to the author,

> I am sorry that my response has been so tardy. However, this most probably reflects that there are very few successful interactions between labor and the schools. I am very sorry to admit this sad state of affairs but note that educators, as a whole, have been less than enthusiastic in dealing with organized labor.[38]

Four distinct but interrelated categories, each of which is discussed separately, constitute the operational considerations we must address. These are:

The "Turf" problem
Roles of participants in the schools
Labor as a curricular subject
Work-experience and economic realities

THE "TURF" PROBLEM

The issue raised in the statement by the Operating Engineers which appears above is essentially a question of "turf." We use this word with the conscious intention of invoking images of the colloquial meanings associated with "turf," for at the core this is an issue of institutional territory, of what is appropriate for the School and the Union.

The document from which the operating engineers statement is lifted is a good example of the territorial issue. Entitled "A Critical Analysis of the Texas Education Agency–United States Office of Education 'Career Education Cluster Plan.'" It was adopted by the AFL-CIO in convention as a policy statement in 1973. While it is not necessary to quote extensively from the statement, the following excerpts provide some of the flavor of the critique:

> The USOE-Texas Education Agency's career education "construction cluster" proposal is seriously misguided both in conception and in detail–in strategy and tactics.
>
> **********
>
> Every heavy equipment apprenticeship program spends more per student training operating engineers than the richest public school district spends

per student in all subjects combined. The public schools couldn't duplicate this investment, *nor should they*.

****

The schools should give students a better idea of the challenges and possibilities available in the world of work. In the construction industry, the Industrial Arts Curriculum Projects *World of Construction* series is a step in the right direction.[39]

These sorts of specific points critiquing existing career education practices must be taken into account in ongoing activities. Leaving aside the work-experience issue for the moment, the issue raised here regarding whose turf the description and organization of job details should be is a major one. In response to the author's generalized request for information on their career education activities, many unions sent examples of their work in the area of job description. The Associated Artists and Actors of America, for example, described their publications on acting.[40] American Federation of Musicians responded with several slickly-produced brochures on music careers.[41] The Telecommunications International Union sent job descriptions for careers in the telephone industry.[42]

These are only a few examples; there are many more, which include occupations as diverse as electrical workers, barbers, and bartenders. What has been amply demonstrated is that unions consider career development materials *in their own fields* to be their right and responsibility–in short, their turf. The questions they raise regard the practice of career educators who, either through ignorance or choice, disregard these materials, and in consequence invade labor's turf.

ROLES OF SCHOOL PARTICIPANTS

The previous issue is directly related to the issue of the function of the public school. At the conceptual level, as we have seen, this takes the form of historic support by unions for public education. At the operational level, the form is the role of those who are associated with schooling.

"I have never attempted to milk a cow," writes John Sessions in "Unions, Education and Employment," "but I am vain enough to think that I could develop a better curriculum on how to do it than could most dairy farmers."[43] In the same article, he spells it out:

I am convinced that teaching is a highly skilled profession. . . Students. . . learn. . . better if the learning takes place under the direction of a professionally qualified teacher.[44]

The implication is that career education must, first, be more careful in clarifying the roles of the classroom teacher and others associated with the enterprise and, second, maintain public control of public schooling. Elsewhere Sessions has stated flatly that labor was totally opposed to OE's "employer-based model" for career education.[45] It is not difficult to anticipate, then, labor's anxiety over career education and the relationship of "outside forces" to the schools. This has, in fact, been the case at the operational level. As one educator stated to the author,

> organized labor contributes very little to career education at the local school level. The adversary relationship they have with management seems to carry over. . . . This provides a particularly adverse effect when contrasted with the general cooperation received from business and industry.[46]

We will return to this issue in a slightly modified form when we discuss work experience. It remains an obstacle to be removed before effective implementation at the local level can occur.

LABOR IN THE CURRICULUM

Previous discussions of the image of work and of the lack of knowledge of labor history among educators and its consequences in the career education curriculum have touched on another practical problem in the view of unions. In general, the issue is the absence of labor studies at all levels of schooling. Specifically, the question is one of career educators' commitment to their student's learning about the role of unions in their future jobs.

Stephen H. Confer, of the Communications Workers of America (CWA) Headquarters/Staff Training, delineated the issue succinctly:

> In addition to the obvious reasons why labor's point of view should be considered, membership and involvement in a union may well be an important part of the young persons' working life, a part which has been ignored by specialists in career education up to this time.[47]

And W. H. McClennan, President of the International Association of Firefighters, has commented on the broader issue:

> It is my conviction that it is essential to an improvement in this general situation for schools at all levels to provide adequate, unprejudiced instruction in labor history, organization and functioning. This should begin in high school and should certainly be offered at the university level.[48]

Because such instruction has not been a part of the career education model in the past, labor has again avoided an enthusiastic commitment to implementation.

WORK EXPERIENCE

Of all the impediments to practical application of career education concepts, labor's attitude toward work experience may be the most significant. Because the theory and practice of work experience in education touches upon so many elements of real or perceived conflict between labor interests and management interests, it may well prove to be the issue that ultimately determines the outcome of many of the other facets of the labor-education relationship.

Though other factors have appeared in the debate over work experience, there seem to be five primary areas urgently requiring recognition in practice:

1) remuneration;
2) protective labor laws;
3) productivity;
4) unemployment; and
5) apprenticeships.

Let us look more closely at each.

1) Remuneration: To career educators the question of paid versus unpaid work experience is open to debate. Hoyt, among others, has indicated that he sees a need for both forms; he conceives a spectrum of activities culminating in paid work experience "as the student moves closer to making bonafide occupational choices."[49]

In contrast, unions view unpaid work experience as anathema. As Sessions has noted,

> Discussions about learners in the workplace tend to proceed with equanimity until the concept becomes sullied by the practical subject of remuneration.[50]

We necessarily return to this subject throughout the remainder of this discussion. But, to generalize, on the "practical subject of remuneration," there is a basic conflict on the question of whether students should be paid. Educators say, "Sometimes; how often depends on the nature of the experience." Unionists retort, "Hardly ever, and we will say when."

2) Protective Labor Laws: Union leaders consider the possibility of the destruction of minimum wage and child labor laws through misapplied work experience programs as a problem of intense degree. As Thomas F. Murphy, president of the International Union of Bricklayers and Allied Craftsmen, wrote to the author, unions are–

> extremely mindful and sensitive to the hazards of violations of child labor laws, and the performance of work in frustration of minimum wage laws, not to mention negotiated and prevailing rates.[51]

Sessions has written extensively on this area, bluntly stating in one essay,

> Labor will not permit the erosion of the negotiated wage structure. Nor will labor permit violations of the child-labor laws in the name of education.[52]

Given the depth of union concern with this aspect of the work experience, the literature and spokespersons of career education have been woefully unresponsive in their reassurances that student workers do not in practical consequence negate organized labor's historical task.

3) Productivity: "The changes called for by career education," according to Hoyt, "can, in my opinion, be viewed as making some contributions toward increasing productivity."[53] Productivity's relationship to education and the workplace is actually a much broader issue than only work experience aspects. We raise it here specifically to point out labor's fear that students in the workplace will be manipulated by management to promote "speed up" in the job situation.

This is by no means a fantastic bit of labor propaganda in the ongoing battle with management. Labor leaders have interpreted this as a result of their experience with interns in several specific situations. And as Wirtz indicates, in a slightly different context, in *The Boundless Resource:*

> This effort and these prospects cannot be isolated from the concerns of the American labor movement. Workers and their jobs are the essence of what unions are about. Unions, since their inception, have concerned themselves with working conditions, pay, hours of work, fringe benefits, grievance procedures, representation in general, and other agenda items not easily distinguishable from whatever is meant to be implied by "quality of work." It is the unfortunate fact that unprincipled opportunists have tried to exploit these new approaches as effective "union busting" tactics. Because increased productivity is unquestionably a principal, and entirely legitimate, concern of many management participants in these job enrichment and job

redesign efforts, there will be a natural tendency among union leaders to suspect these as being merely more elegant names for the old-fashioned speedup–one more way to exact higher profits from the eight-hour day.[54]

Until unions see pragmatic evidence that work experience is not merely an elegant name for speedup, they will be contentious about their workplace prerogatives.

4) Unemployment: There is a very concrete, practical side to the issue of full employment in the economy and career education: When there are not enough jobs for workers, who *need* to work to live, it is impossible to create jobs for students who are "exploring careers." As Sessions points out,

> On-the-job education programs don't work in periods of substantial unemployment.... Under conditions of widespread unemployment, it is the educational program which will go down the drain, at least in unionized industries.[55]

Another dimension of the unemployment issue involves the effect of expanded career awareness and opportunity for traditionally excluded groups, such as women and minorities.

Robert Lindsey reports in the September 12, 1976 "New York Times," that:

> During the last two years, and especially in 1976, women have entered the job market at a pace called "extraordinary" by Alan Greenspan, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisors... their decisions to return to work have torpedoed... forecasts of a leveling off of the nation's unemployment rate at 7 percent by the end of this year....[56]

The implications for work experience are clear. If the worker sees the student down the line or at the next desk as potentially taking a fellow unionist's job away after graduation (and, with the realities of racism and sexism, this will be particularly true if the student is black or female), that worker as a good trade unionist must oppose *in principle* the on-the-job education practice.

It is an ironic contradiction: the positive effect of career education (and the women's movement, in this specific example) in encouraging job awareness and expanded vision helps to create the negative consequence of increased unemployment and worker alienation.

5) Apprenticeships: In the viewpoint of organized labor, a critical area in which career educators must clarify their intentions is that of apprenticeship programs. Many unions have worked hard to build such programs on a contractual basis with management, and are suspicious of any real or apparent attempt at erosion of these programs.

To unions the apprenticeship is the vehicle which permits work-experience in a learning situation within the context of negotiated labor-management structures. Elsewhere in this paper we discuss some examples of this context: in the building trades, in the "turf" question to some extent, and so on. In considering the operation of career education concepts in practice we can point to these examples as areas of actual and potential conflict on apprenticeship-related questions.

There have been, of course, counter-examples of smoothly-functioning programs which have pleased both labor leaders and educators in their operation. But to increase the awareness level of career development conceptualizers on this issue we need to point to instances in which things did *not* run smoothly. Any implementation of career education concepts, in other words, which avoids, neglects or negates the established apprenticeship programs which it touches upon will probably find itself in serious trouble, and probably sooner rather than later.

We will give the last word on work experience and labor to a career education expert working closely with labor on the local level. His analysis sums up our previous discussion and serves as a transition to the following sections on strategies for change:

> As representative organizations, labor unions by their very nature must support the interests of their current members, rather than those of potential new members. Students are only potential members with zero seniority. Any appeal in behalf of students is balanced against the needs, real or otherwise, of current members. . . . While unions do not hire people they surely do prevent people from being hired. This contributes to the negative image of always opposing everything which organized labor sometimes has. . . . The protection afforded by a union contract is meaningless to the person who has no job. Only after you get the job does it take on meaning.
>
> As a career educator interested in preparing students for employment as a meaningful part of a total career, the last thing I need is organized labor curtailing my opportunities to place students on sites where actual work experience can be gained. Yet this is precisely what happens. Students are often placed in non-union situations with lower pay and benefits because

there is no way we can gain a placement in a union situation. As I see it, many labor leaders think career education is fine as long as it takes place totally within the confines of a school. Any real world experience that amounts to more than visiting and observing is verboten. However, many students need the experience of actually doing, not merely to gain skill but as a motivational device. They need desperately to learn that they can achieve, that they are competent, that they are capable of acting on the world rather than constantly reacting to it. If they can gain this knowledge it then acts as a stimulus to achievement of academic skills.[57]

PART II–STRATEGIES

There has been much current emphasis in the schools on "career education." In an effort to make the development of career education realistic and meaningful, the AFL-CIO nationally and its affiliated unions and State federations have been deeply involved in planning activities. The active involvement of labor in the earliest phases of planning is essential if career education programs are to be successful. In an unfortunate number of situations, employers have been invited to participate in career education planning but unions have not. In other instances, it has sometimes appeared that it was not labor's advice which has been wanted so much as its seal of approval.

Labor representatives have effectively expressed their concern with this narrow approach to career education. Some of the most blatantly misguided career education proposals have been shelved, among them "the employer-based model of career education," a plan which was strongly opposed by the AFL-CIO.

Labor has warned against permitting vaguely, thought through career education plans, to convert the schools into little more than job training institutions. Relating education to the world of work is important, but it is equally important that education be related to preparing students for the demands of citizenship, for their future roles as members of their families, and for the fullest development of their human potential. Although most of the official spokesmen for career education pay lip service to this principle, their actions do not always follow their rhetoric.

Considering the importance which has been placed on career education, it is remarkable that it has received almost no funding in its own right. Schools everywhere are building "career information centers" out of free literature, a very undependable way of gathering reliable information.

What money has been available for career education has been largely taken from discretionary funds appropriated under the Vocational Education Act. This means that to the extent that career education prospers, there is less money for vocational education.

Equally alarming have been the continuing efforts of the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to explore ways to relax child labor and minimum wage laws for teenagers. In a period of high unemployment, the inevitable result of relaxing these laws would be to encourage employers to hire low-wage teenagers at the expense of adult workers.

–"The AFL-CIO Platform Proposals," 1976[58]

As much as possible, in this part of the paper, organized labor speaks not via the author's interpretations, but for itself.

It seems to be a fact of action-oriented research that the portion suggesting specific proposals or recommendations is always far shorter than the section oriented toward intellectual, abstract and/or analytical discussion. This is partially a function of the predilection of researchers to pontificate and philosophize. This is not, we hope, the predominant operant factor in this particular research paper. Rather, the author maintains, in this case the cause is the level of lack of interest and participation in career education by unions thus far. A necessary consequence of this low level of *input* is a relatively low level of *output* in the form of analytical statements and position papers. This situation is rapidly changing, as is labor's attitude toward the potential benefits of career education.

But the past neglect *of* the career education movement *by* the labor movement (and vice versa) is reflected in these comments submitted to the author by union spokespersons:

Unfortunately, I cannot answer your questions on career education simply because we have no current information, studies, or experience. . . .[59]

****

I'm afraid there's not much more we can tell you. We are maintaining our interest however, even though it is not one of our top priorities.[60]

****

I regret to tell you that we have no data that would be of assistance to you. . . . Our main concerns are elsewhere, and as a consequence we have

neither collected nor developed the material upon which to base a public position.[61]

Clearly, it is now the responsibility of both labor leaders and career educators to take each other seriously and begin to work out methods of implementation. When active unions are the rule and passive unions the exception, progress will have been made.

Hoyt, in a recent address, listed the "basic restraints to implementation" as the following "Obstacles":

1. *The Pendulum Problem* of "bringing a proper emphasis to education, as preparation for work."

2. *The Impotence Image* that "the greatest power of career education lies in its complete impotence–in its absolute dependence on the increased strengthening of a wide variety of existing educational programs."

3. *The Definitional Dilemma* of "our attempt to redefine the four-letter word, "work"–and so to change the meaning of education as preparation for work."

4. *The Teacher Trap* that insists that "while career education is a truly collaborative effort, the classroom teacher is the key person involved in its success–or its failure."

5. *The Collaborative Quandary*, or the problem of "crying for educational reform while admitting, from the outset, that educators will never be able to bring about this reform by themselves."[62]

Every aspect of these restraints has direct connections to career education vis-a-vis organized labor. One can state it more strongly: labor is inextricably involved in all five "obstacles" and can choose to help or to hinder each situation.

The sections which follow begin to explore the short- and long-range consequences of this reality.

Short-Range Implementation

An Introduction to Career Education lists five initial implementation tasks for the "business-labor-industry" community:

1. Provide observational, work experience, and work-study opportunities for students *and* for those who educate students. . . .

2. Serve as career development resource personnel. . . .

3. Participate in part-time-and full-time placement programs.

4. Participate actively and positively in programs designed to reduce worker alienation.

5. Participate in career education policy formulation.[63]

Before labor enthusiastically embraces its role (and its bedfellows) in this communal pursuit, it has its own initial implementation agenda to which career education must respond. Labor's agenda has not been stated as succinctly as OE's, but by interpolating from various statements in recent years, it is possible to classify the labor plan for implementation into three general task-oriented proposals:

A. Increase the participation of organized labor in ongoing career development programs, and make certain it is understood that such participation justifiably reflects the interests and needs of workers in the workplace.

B. Reconsider and revise the framework for work-experience to take into account labor's view of economic realities (such as unemployment) and the needs of workers for protection from management incursions (such as in negotiated wage structure and productivity).

C. Encourage the infusion of labor study programs as part of comprehensive career education at all school levels, with union involvement in curriculum development.

These proposals reflect the initiative of specific labor organizations and individuals. The remainder of this section documents these initiatives by citing the sources from which the above proposals evolved.

PROPOSAL A

"I find little in the literature of career education," writes John Sessions, "which sees labor as a creative resource."[64] He sees the question of how to involve organized labor as straightforward and simple:

> In developing career programs . . . the manpower training arm of organized labor is the Human Resources Development Institute. . . . Their nearest field representatives can be contacted by calling the AFL-CIO local central body. . . and the time to do it is the morning of the first day that you decide it might be a good idea to begin a career development program. . . .[65]

Al Lorente of the UAW has proposed advisory committees at Federal, State, regional and local levels in which organized labor will play a leading role. Here is Lorente's list of what can be expected of labor representatives on these committees:

—Assistance as new goals and objectives are developed for public education, making it more relevant to the true needs of students.

—Assistance in the recruitment of a cadre of resource personnel from organized labor who can supplement guidance and counseling activities.

—Lend assistance in the expansion of cooperative and distributive educational programs, harnessing the wealth of learning potential provided by the total community.

—Assist in confirming needed performance indicators or objectives, that are developed for students. These indicators, or objectives, could relate to all instructional areas, whether it be career development, academic, vocational or technical subject areas.

—Provide input to develop, support and endorse new funding mechanisms that are needed to improve public education and insure that quality education is made available to all students involved in the public education process.[66]

In a significant endorsement, Lorente has expressed general agreement with OE's approaches; the UAW believes that they are basically "on the right track." But Lorente has publicly expressed one suggestion specifically aimed at OE and its organizational patterns. In congressional testimony before the House Committee on Education and Labor in February 1976, he commented on a UAW "special concern:"

> That concern centers around the fact that there is no representative from organized labor on the National Advisory Council for Career Education. This glaring omission has created resentment, suspicion and hostility toward career education from various sectors of organized labor.[67]

That same testimony contained other comments related to labor involvement. Lorente suggested expanding "the definition of Career education to include *more* than job awareness, exploration, decisionmaking and planning."[68] And he goes on to describe how the UAW developed its positions in

part through contact with the Michigan Career Education Advisory Commission. Their participation there, in fact, leads Lorente to predict that:

> when and if a representative from organized labor sits on the National Advisory Council, promotion and implementation of career education will be accomplished much easier.[69]

It will be interesting to see if (and when) this prediction proves accurate in the future.

In his congressional testimony, Lorente identifies another area of involvement for labor–encouraging policymaking bodies to fully fund career education programs. He refers to the specific provisions of the bill (HR 11023) under consideration and suggests expanding the funding provisions and removing the strict time lines to make funding more readily available to school districts.

These comments are a direct predecessor to the proposals offered by the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) in a Resolution of their August 1976, convention. Some of their implementation guidelines deal with long-range implications and are discussed in the next section. But other proposals have merit as short-range action tasks:

- –Job training programs should be expanded
- –Information about careers should be compiled and made generally available
- –Adult education programs must be expanded
- –Restrictions against adult use of schools should be re-examined.[70]

Looking backward, to 1974, the Resolution on "Education in General" by the 16th International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers (IUE) Convention contains ten points directly addressing career education:

1. Reorder priorities to stress education
2. Support grants to develop non-sexist curricular materials and programs
3. Fight sexism and racism in education
4. Encourage educational innovations

5. Replace regressive taxes with direct Federal funding for schools

6. Increase funding for vocational and adult education, provided it is broadly-construed

7. Continue to fight for increased funds for higher education

8. Support a program of 16 years of free public education for all

9. Recommend renewed efforts to end school segregation and encourage cultural pluralism

10. Support broad-based democratic decisionmaking in the educational system.[71]

All of these examples point to the same end: greater labor involvement in career education theory, concepts, and operation. "Many. . . pitfalls. . . could have been avoided," asserts Sessions, "had there been better involvement of organized labor in developing plans for career education."[72]

PROPOSAL B

Since we have dealt so extensively with this issue in previous sections, we will let suffice here three statements regarding on-the-job education which articulate a labor perspective. The first is from Al Lorente's previously-cited testimony:

The proposed legislation should specify that work experience means *non-paid* work experience.

We are also of the firm opinion that student hands-on activities, with employers, which involves direct remuneration, will surely lead toward justification to change child labor laws and relax minimum wage standards. Further, there is a distinct danger that this activity jeopardizes the job security of the existing work force. Viable alternatives to this activity can be developed.[73]

The second is contained in the AFT's recent resolution:

Alternative programs which have a career orientation may be provided for students. . . . While some of these may involve work experience, they must be carefully constructed so that they are clearly the responsibility of the public school system. . . .

Where career education programs involve any kind of experience at the job site they should be tried only in industries where there is full employment and where no adult workers will be displaced. . . .[74]

In the third, Sessions comments on a specific proposition regarding remuneration:

> If educationally-designed work experiences involve unusual training costs for the employer, if the student worker is not able to perform as the employer expects his regular apprentices to perform, then the answer is not to lower the pay scales but to provide subsidization for the employer. Subsidization should not be provided by tax credits, but by contracts, and only where the employer can demonstrate that the costs of the training are substantial. Here again, it is evident that planning the work experience must be a cooperative effort of the schools, the employers, and the unions.[75]

The reader may judge the accuracy and feasibility of these statements as concepts. Educators must respond to the concerns and perceptions of organized labor as they implement programs in local school systems. We return to Sessions who aptly sums up:

> All in all, on-the-job educational programs then can be a valuable part of the total educational experience provided that they are controlled by public-education authorities as a component of a complete curriculum, provided that employers, unions and other relevant community groups participate in the initial and continuous planning on a basis of equality, and provided that as a nation we adopt policies designed to create a full-employment economy.[76]

PROPOSAL C

Not only the children of working-class families but all Americans need to know more about the history of labor in this country. As Richard O. Boyer and Herbert Morris stress in *Labor's Untold Story*,

> Labor's story, still untold and largely missing from textbooks and conventional history, is more than an account of strikes, spies, and frame-ups, of organizing and building unions of men and women fighting and dying for better lives in a better America. . . .
>
> Fundamentally, labor's story is the story of the American people. To view it narrowly, to concentrate on the history of specific trade unions or on the careers of individuals and their rivalries would be to miss the point that the great forces which have swept the American people into action have been the very forces that have also molded labor.[77]

This will stand as an excellent conceptual framework for the task at hand, but the implementation of that goal of spreading labor's story is far from accomplished. It is the unionists' contention that the career education

movement, both as an act of good faith and in the interests of academic and curricular completeness, must infuse the study of labor into the career development concept.

Labor, it goes without saying, will be delighted to help in this enterprise. Career educators may draw on the organizational expertise of union education departments and follow the models of union-school cooperation which have produced such ventures as the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees–College of New Rochelle "District 37 Campus;" the District 65–Distributive Workers of America–Hofstra University "Institute of Applied Social Science;" and the AFL-CIO Labor Studies Center.[78] These are just three among other current examples of the historical precedent of union involvement in the education of workers, stretching nearly a century and a half.

Career education, too, may depend on the expert aid of unions in the development of relevant curriculum and instructional materials. The UAW education department, for example, has produced sophisticated programmed textbooks on work-related issues.[79] As another example, in a collaborative effort of representatives from educational and labor organizations, a comprehensive curriculum package called "Labor Unions: Progress and Promise" has been produced.

According to one of the developers, Hal Kessler, the material was developed because the response to the question "does the curriculum include a substantial and fair treatment of the role of organized labor in American society?" must be answered in the negative. He continues:

> There is a great deal that has to be done by way of labor education within the union, but I suggest that even more important is the fact that all teachers. . . have an obligation to deal with the problems and progress of the American labor movement in their classrooms.[80]

Among the topics covered, besides an historical perspective on unionism, are:

–the structure and functions of unions

–collective bargaining

–contracts

–grievances and grievance procedures

–the role of unions in the community.

It is this sort of study material that organized labor wants to see as a part of the career curriculum.

And what of the outcome for the learners after they study such materials? Gus Tyler phrases it best in a series of questions that points the way:

> I should like to see a thoroughgoing review and revision of textbooks and school curriculums with an eye to the image of labor and the labor movement. Who built our railroads—I mean who built it, not who financed it? Our canals, highways, skyscrapers, tunnels? Who created our work songs, our sea chanties, our plantation melodies? Who ended child labor, opened free schools, established clinics, provided housing, battled for major humane legislation over a century and a half? What is a union, a contract, a grievance, a strike? Why have men and women died for their union as they have died for their country? Who is William Sylvis, Samuel Gompers, Phillip Randolph, John Mitchell, Mother Jones, Andrew Furuseth, Morris Hilquit, Bill Haywood? In short, there is a great heritage in American labor that, properly related, would create pride in being one of that great class that works—really works—for a living.[81]

Long Range Implications

In the long-term view, what are the implications of the issues we have raised and the implementation strategies we have discussed? For answers, we need to return to our most helpful sources—the OE policy paper and the union spokespersons.

Taken as a whole, three sections of *An Introduction to Career Education* serve as the foundation for a long-range outlook on the prospects for such educational reform to succeed. The twenty-five "programmatic assumptions" provide a set of researchable hypotheses to stimulate developmental probes. Nine "learner outcomes," listed as essential goals, demonstrate the framework for evaluating individual accomplishment as students leave schools. And the fourteen "basic educational changes championed by career education" enunciate a manifesto for innovation by which one can judge the broad impact of the movement on educational institutions.[82]

The OE paper finds three basic implications in the assumptions, outcomes, and changes they propose. These are:

1. Though initial career education reforms are not expensive, total educational reform will be.

2. Much of the additional money required is available in tax-supported educational systems outside the public K-16 systems.

3. The days of educational isolationism are over.[83]

In terms of organized labor's relationship to these reforms, there seem to be three long term strategies which correspond in some ways to the implications of OE's formulation. Briefly, these can be summarized as:

A. Clarification by unions of their positions on career education and increased initiative to gain acceptance of their concepts within the career education movement.

B. Expansion and modification of work-experience to include union-sponsored apprenticeship and on-the-job training programs—in theory and practice.

C. Recognition and consolidation of the role of labor education in interpreting and implementing lifelong learning.

Each of these three long-range propositions needs to be examined more closely.

PROPOSITION A

As an outgrowth of their perception of exclusion from definitional processes in the early stages of the career education movement, unions have become more assertive in demanding representation and consultation. In the long run this is a healthy and positive phenomenon. Even now many labor correspondents have indicated to the author increased confidence in the evolving conceptual framework for career development programs. OE's policy paper, in fact, did have labor [illegible] and was a solid first step toward facilitating collaboration.

A concrete advantage of labor support will be the historical "clout" unions have been able to provide in lobbying for funding for public education. If organized labor will throw its weight behind career education, that alliance will provide resolute and formidable power as the reforms move from the initial demonstration (and inexpensive) to the total infusion (and expensive) phases.

Another development relevant to this discussion should be encouraged by career educators. Unions are beginning to issue specific and detailed resolutions and statements on education and work. The more codified material available from labor, the better able career educators will be to respond to clearly-stated

critique and analysis of their plans. This process will clear up misunderstandings, on the one hand, and highlight any deep philosophical and theoretical differences, on the other. Both parties to the debate will know which issues are trivial and which substantial. Clear and reasoned responses will follow.

Because this initiative on the part of organized labor to clarify their attitudes toward career education in formal position papers is so significant, three of the recent statements are reproduced in their entirety in the appendix: The 1974 IUE Resolution "Education in General," the 1976 "UAW Career Education Statement," and the 1976 AFT Resolution "Education and Work" deserve careful reading for what they may portend.

PROPOSITION B

Relating both to the question of non-public school education and to isolationism is the long term implication of the union attitude toward work-experience. Without reviving our earlier debate about paid vs. unpaid, labor laws, etc., what seems to need intensive exploration is the relationship of work-experience in career education to apprenticeships in labor education.

Unions have taken the position that much of the work-experience career educators want students to have can take place within the framework of already established on-the-job educational opportunities sponsored by organized labor. This position would appear to answer OE's request to seek supportive funding for career education in alternative educational systems. It is, for example, to a large extent tax supported: through the U.S. Department of Labor alone, more than 400,000 people at a cost of $35 million a year are involved in union-sponsored training.[84] In one case, a summer program for vocational exploration jointly sponsored by the AFL-CIO and the National Alliance of Businessmen has received Labor Department funding.[85] And there needs to be more study of organized labor's role at the State level, as in the instance of their support of trade/technical programs in the Wisconsin vocational, technical and adult education institutions, and the exemplary participation by the UAW in Michigan.

PROPOSITION C

Unions can also help to end educational isolationism. Through labor education programs unions are already deeply involved in adult education. As Norman Eiger, Associate Director of the Rutgers University Labor Education Center, writes,

> If adult education can be considered as the genus, then labor education can properly be thought of as a specialized species of the broader field. It is distinguished from adult education in the constituency it primarily serves, how that constituency is reached, the institutions that provide labor education services, and its values, goals, content, and methodology.[86]

Eiger continues to state the five priorities for the Center, in addition to basic trade union education:

1. providing understanding of racism and involving labor in urban problem-solving,

2. encouraging other educational institutions to aid in working people's learning,

3. refining concepts of work and leisure and promoting more productive use of leisure,

4. enhancing understanding of international labor, economic and social affairs,

5. producing instructional materials[8 7]

There is an obvious connection between these priorities and career education's promotion of lifelong learning. In the long run both groups will benefit if labor educators and career educators convene to discuss areas of mutual concern. The researchers of both fields, too, should explore and analyze the possibilities for future cooperation. Based on their past academic and instructional ventures, there should be in the future a prominent role for labor educators in the career education movement. Educators concerned with the educational needs of workers have understood historically the concept of lifelong learning better than most. Career education needs their experience, perspective, and vision.

PART III—CONCLUSIONS AND SUMMARY

Some Tentative Conclusions

Though this is the end of this paper it may be only the beginning of the topic.

What we conclude based on the past relationships between labor and career education may be outdated, given the ongoing redefinitions of those relationships and their speedy evolution.

Nevertheless, we may return to the matters raised in the Introduction to assess where things stand now. In doing this, we must still keep in mind our caution, our issue, and our question.

The caution to remember that *labor* and *education* may be different than *organized* labor and the *Office* of Education remains appropriate. The evidence does seem to indicate that we have dealt with most if not all of the major issues through that union-OE focus, and that in the near future both OE and the unions will continue to define the paramaters of the career education discussion.

It will be necessary, however, to explore other versions and visions of the education-work nexus to complete the picture. The research priorities of the National Institute of Education, for example, have been and will continue to be significant in structuring the career education environment. The approaches and projects of the Departments of Labor and Commerce, and of private organizations, are also informational resources.

In addition, the viewpoints of other educators and conceptualizers of career development must be utilized. Particularly through the critiques of a "loyal opposition," new directions in career education may emerge.

And in a somewhat different manner it is also important to maintain an awareness of the internal dynamics of the trade union movement. The potential shifts of emphasis and philosophy which may occur through the ascendancy to positions of power of new labor leaders are variables to consider. The realignments caused by rank and file groups within the unions, too, may prove to contribute modifications in labor attitudes toward career education programs.

If there is any method that can be devised to gain input from the ranks of unorganized workers, that opinion also will be useful. We may continue to focus, in other words, on the current leaders in the movement, but within our peripheral vision we need to keep other forces under observation.

The ideological implications of the "fundamental issue" we discussed in the Introduction remains one of the considerations for our future analysis. We can, in fact, link it up with the Introduction's "primary question" to suggest a crucial conclusion of this research.

Even after all the documentation and analysis of the preceding pages we are no closer to resolving this fundamental issue and answering this primary question than we were in the Introduction. In fact, by stressing the current situations and near-future probabilities, we actually may be a step further removed from resolution and solution.

We need to resolve the underlying theoretical critiques which have emerged recently not from the educational reformers mentioned previously but by the

social critics thus far unmentioned. Such observers of the educational scene as Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis;[88] such scholars of work as James O'Toole;[89] and, most specifically, such critics of vocational/career education as Marvin Lazerson and Norton Grubb[90] have raised profound and as yet unresolved questions which career educators cannot avoid.

The task, then, for the career education movement is to move forward on two fronts. As seems now conventional, we can call one "theory" and the other "practice."

In *practice* career education must move beyond the demonstration phase and into the implementation phase and prove that the conceptual framework within which the reforms operate is valid. It is obvious on this front that trade unions have played and will continue to play a pivotal role in the movement's success or failure.

The broader theoretical questions, too, need responses. Career education has in general opted for the basic economic, political, and social forms of organization that define this country in the last half of the twentieth century. It is self-consciously reformist rather than revolutionary.

But the adequacy of reform solutions in career development, in education, and in work, are exactly what are being called to task. In the adequacy of the career educators' theoretical defense, and in the implementation of the practical applications of that defense, lies the answer to those who challenge reform as inadequate. Perhaps fortunately, since it tends to sharpen the debate, it is not yet clear whether career education theory and practice does meet that challenge.

It may appear less obvious on the theoretical level that the labor movement is essential to the definitional process. But by their very nature they must constantly deal with fundamental issues—of class, of race, of sex; of economic, political, and social forms. Without the labor perspective on career education theory there may be no chance of constructing the reform rationale that needs to be articulated.

Our tentative conclusion, then, is best phrased in the form of a series of three questions which remain to be explored:

In what direction should our society move?

How will career education help or hinder that movement?

And how does the labor movement fit the direction of career education?

Note that our final questions have been consciously constructed to be impossible to answer simplistically and conventionally, with "yesses" or "noes."

An Action-Oriented Summary

In the preceding pages we have identified some of the issues and strategies related to the relationship or organized labor in the implementation of career education.

We indicated three levels of issue considerations: theoretical, conceptual, and operational. We considered two aspects of strategic planning: short-range implementation and long-range implications.

Among the theoretical considerations discussed were the following:

1. Hypotheses regarding the nature of work and the applicability of these to the theories held by labor leaders and career educators;

2. The expansion of educational theory to include not only formal schooling but also learning situations other than the school, particularly the mass media and specifically television;

3. Differing views of the transition between education and work and how this phase of career development is looked at by union leaders and educators.

Among the conceptual considerations raised were:

1. The problem of lack of definition of terms;

2. The relation of labor to public education;

3. The potential narrowing of choice in career education in labor's view;

4. The real prospects for the collaborative relationships outlined in career education tenets.

Among the operational considerations examined were these:

1. The "Turf" problem of what are appropriate areas for which social institutions;

2. Roles of participants in the schools and how changes in them may be useful or not so useful;

3. The importance of labor as a curricular subject in the viewpoint of each area;

4. The economic realities of the work-experience question, including ramifications of the debate over remuneration, protective labor laws, productivity, unemployment, and apprenticeship programs.

Implementation strategies considered were threefold:

1. Increasing the participation of organized labor in ongoing career development programs;

2. Reconsidering and revising the framework for work-experience;

3. Encouraging the development of labor studies programs in the school curriculum.

Three propositions were suggested as long-term possibilities:

1. Clarifying the positions of unions on career education and increasing their profile within the career education movement;

2. Expanding and modifying work-experience to accommodate union viewpoints;

3. Recognizing and consolidating the role of labor education in life-long learning programs.

Boiled down to the most significant essentials, the following five action-oriented recommendations are offered as methods to enhance the participation of labor in the implementation of career education:

1. Provide research support and investigate demonstration projects to analyze the uses of the mass media, particularly television, in modifying negative images of workers and unions and educating viewers on career development topics.

2. Encourage the quick elimination of class, sex and race bias in career education materials, classroom instruction, and guidance.

3. Appoint labor representatives, with full participation rights, to career education decisionmaking agencies at the Federal, State and local levels; and, particularly and specifically, on the National Advisory Council on Career Education.

4. Resolve the quandary of divergent viewpoints on work-experience, primarily by following union recommendations and procedures where feasible, and secondarily by ensuring consensus via negotiated compromise in all other situations.

5. Incorporate in all future discussions of and plans for comprehensive career education programs a component oriented toward labor studies and history for which union and labor education input is solicited.

The result of good faith effort to act upon these recommendations should produce a series of further recommendations upon which the foundation of organized labor–career education collaboration can be laid.

NOTES

1Cf., for example, the writings of Normal Gysbers or Keith Goldhammer for non-OE conceptual frameworks.

[2]Printed as a pamphlet, October, 1975; available from UAW, pp. 6-7.

[3]HEW Task Force Report, *Work in America* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1974), p. 2.

[4]Ibid., p. 3.

[5]Studs Terkel, *Working* (New York: Avon, 1975), p. xiii.

[6]Cf, for example, his papers "Career Education, Vocational Education, and Occupational Education: An Approach to Defining Differences," and "Career Education and Work Experience Education: Can We Join Together?" (February, 1976).

[7]This notion is of course a fundamental OE concept of career education and is found in nearly all of the writings on the subject with which OE is associated.

[8]Available as a reprint from the AFL-CIO.

[9]Sidney P. Marland, Jr., *Career Education: A Proposal for Reform* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974), p. 109.

[10]For example, the "employer (experience)-based model" and the "home-based model" explicitly go beyond the school (and the "school-based model") to take this into account.

[11]For a bibliography of relevant research on this subject, see F. Gerald Kline and Phillip J. Tichenor, editors, *Current Perspectives in Mass Communications Research* (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1972). Also Ralph O. Nofziger and David M. White, editors, *Methods of Research In Communication* (New York: Houghton & Mifflin, 1970); George Comstock and George Lindsey, *Television and Human Behavior: The Research Horizon, Future and Present* (Santa Monica, Cal.: Rand, 1975).

[12]HEW, *op. cit.*, p. 34-35

[13]Paul Lauter and Florence Howe, *The Conspiracy of the Young* (New York: Meridian, 1971), p. 227.

[14]Available from Women on Words and Images, New Jersey.

[15]George Gerbner and Larry Gross, "Living With Television: The Violence Profile," *Journal of Communication*, Vol. 26, Number 2 (Spring 1976), p. 189.

[16]William H. McClennan, President, International Association of Firefighters, personal letter.

[17]The National Manpower Institute, Washington, D.C., was awarded a Federal grant earlier this year to begin to implement some of Wirtz's strategies on a demonstration basis. Data on this project will accumulate over the next several years.

[18]Gus Tyler, "Career Education and Society's Imperatives," in Larry McClure and Carolyn Buan, editors, *Essays on Career Education* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973), pp. 171-175.

[19]Willard Wirtz and the National Manpower Institute, *The Boundless Resource: A Prospectus for an Education/Work Policy* (Washington, D.C.: New Republic Book Company, 1975), pp. 169-182.

[20]Robert M. Strauber, Education Director, United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum and Plastic Workers of America, personal letter.

[21]See Kenneth B. Hoyt, "Obstacles and Opportunities in Career Education" (mimeo; remarks to the New Mexico Career Education Conference, June 7, 1976), pp. 6-8.

[22]Kenneth B. Hoyt, *An Introduction to Career Education: A Policy Paper of the U.S. Office of Education* (DHEW Publication No. (OE) 75-00504), p. 3.

[23]Terkel, *op. cit.*, p. xi.

[24]See Hoyt, "Career Education, Vocational Education, and Occupational Education: An Approach to Defining Differences," *passim.*

[25]Hoyt, *Introduction, op. cit.*, p. 4-5.

[26]*Ibid.*, p. 4.

[27]United Auto Workers, "Labor's Historic Support of Public Education: A Chronology" (Detroit, Mich.: UAW Publication No. 405, 1974), p. 1-2.

[28]Tyler, *op. cit.*, p. 167.

[29]Quoted in Sessions "Misdirecting Career Education."

[30]*Ibid.*

[31]*Ibid.*

[32]*Ibid.*

[33]Calvin M. McIntyre, personal letter.

[34]Kenneth B. Hoyt, "Career Education and the Business-Labor-Industry Community," (mimeo; paper for National Apprenticeship and Training Directors Conference, 1975), pp. 6-7.

[35]Marland, *op. cit.*, pp. 243-265.

[36]Kenneth R. Edwards, "Career Education: A Paper for Discussion" (mimeo; 1972), pp. 11-12.

[37]International Union of Operating Engineers, "A Critical Analysis of the Texas Education Agency–United States Office of Education Career Education Construction Cluster Plan" (mimeo; 1973), p. 2.

[38]William E. Weisgerber, personal letter.

[39]Operating Engineers, *op. cit., passim.*

[40]Frederick O'Neal, President, Associated Actors and Artistes of America, personal letter.

[41]American Federation of Musicians, "Music Is Your Business," "Young Sounds of the AFM," "The Music Code of Ethics" (provided by Dick Moore and Associates, Inc., New York, N.Y.).

[42]Robert Leventhal, Administrative Assistant, Telecommunications International Union, personal letter.

[43]John A. Sessions, "Unions, Education, and Employment," *Changing Education*, Summer 1973, p. 25.

[44]*Ibid.*

[45]Sessions, *op. cit.*

[46]McIntyre, personal letter.

[47]Quoted in *Career Education News*, February 1, 1976.

[48]Personal letter.

[49]Hoyt, "Career Education and Work Experience Education," *op. cit.*, p. 8.

[50]Sessions, "Unions," *op. cit.*, p. 27.

[51]Personal letter.

[52]Sessions, "Unions," *op. cit.*, p. 27.

[53]Kenneth B. Hoyt, "Career Education's Potential for Increasing Productivity" (mimeo; paper for the National Federation of Independent Business, 1975), p. 2.

[54]Wirtz, *op. cit.*, p. 94.

[55]Sessions, "Unions," *op. cit.*, p. 27.

[56]Robert Lindsey, "Women Entering Job Market at an 'Extraordinary' Pace," *New York Times*, Sept. 12, 1976, p. 1.

[57]McIntyre, personal letter.

[58]"The AFL-CIO Platform Proposals: Presented to the Democratic and Republican National Conventions, 1976," p. 36.

[59]George A. Kanyok, Assistant Education Director, Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, personal letter.

[60]George K. Daitsman, Education Director, International Union, Allied Industrial Workers of America, personal letter.

[61]Robert W. Dudnick, Assistant Director of Research and Information, The Newspaper Guild, personal letter.

[62]Hoyt, "Obstacles," *op. cit., passim.*

[63]Hoyt, "Introduction," *op. cit.*, p. 9.

[64]John A. Sessions, "Unions as a Resource in Career Education" (mimeo 1976), p. 7.

[65]*Ibid.*, p. 10. Several correspondents, it should be noted here, have reported that they have not always successfully followed this advice, attributing their lack of success to recalcitrance on the local level.

[66]Al Lorente, "Remarks: U.S. Department of Commerce Hearings Held at Kellogg Center, Michigan State University, E. Lansing, Michigan" (mimeo 1976), pp. 5-6.

[67]Al Lorente, "Text of Remarks Made at a Hearing Before Carl D. Perkins, Chairman, and Various Members of the House Committee on Education and Labor" (mimeo 1976), p. 3.

[68]*Ibid.*, p. 1.

[69]*Ibid.*, p. 4.

[70]Resolution No. 43, reproduced in Appendix.

[71]Resolution No. 20, reproduced in Appendix.

[72]Sessions, "Resource," *op. cit.*, p. 7.

[73]Lorente, "Text," *op. cit.*, p. 2.

[74]See Appendix.

[75]Sessions, "Unions," *op. cit.*, p. 27.

[76]*Ibid.*

[77]Richard O. Boyer and Herbert M. Morais, *Labor's Untold Story* (New York: United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, 1971), p. 11.

[78]Further information on these programs is available from the unions in each case. One interesting aspect of the AFL-CIO Labor Studies Center program is the relationship with Antioch College which certifies the bachelor of arts degree curriculum.

[79]See for example *The Union Steward at Work: A Programmed Instruction Series* (1973).

[80]Hal Kessler, "New Curriculum Package on Unions Now Available," *The PFT Reporter* [Philadelphia Federation of Teachers], May 1973.

[81]Gus Tyler, "What Kind of Career Education?" (mimeo 1973), pp. 17-18.

[82]Cf. pp. 5-8, p. 11, and pp. 12-13, respectively.

[83]Cf. pp. 13-14.

[84]"Trade Training," *Guidepost*, Sept. 9, 1976.

[85]"HRDI Enrolls Needy Youths In Jobs Project," *AFL-CIO News*, July 24, 1976.

[86]Norman Eiger, "Labor Education–A Past and Future View," *The New Jersey Adult Educator*, Winter 1975, p. 13.

[87]*Ibid.*, p. 14.

[88]See Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, *Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life* (New York: Basic, 1976). Also Christopher Jencks *et al.*, *Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effects of Family and Schooling in America* (New York: Basic, 1972).

[89]See James O'Toole, "The Reserve Army of the Underemployed," *Change*, May & June, 1975.

[90]W. Norton Grubb and Marvin Lazerson, "Rally 'Round the Workplace: Continuities and Fallacies in Career Education," *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 45, No. 4 (November, 1975).

For additional background on this view, see also Marvin Lazerson and W. Norton Grubb, *American Education and Vocationalism: A Documentary History 1870-1970* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1974).

Another recent critique worth considering is "Does Career Education Do Any Good?", *Dollars & Sense*, No. 19 (Sept 1976).

INVOLVING ORGANIZED LABOR IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF CAREER EDUCATION

Kenneth B. Hoyt
Director, Office of Career Education
U.S. Office of Education

July 1978

The role and function of organized labor in implementing career education is most properly determined by members of the organized labor movement. Under this assumption, eleven persons–6 nominated by the AFL/CIO and 5 nominated by the United Autoworkers–gathered together and, for two days, provided direct advice to the Director, Office of Career Education, USOE, on the topic of this monograph. The contents of this monograph represent an attempt to put into narrative form the collective advice given by these persons.

It is crucial to emphasize that the views expressed in this monograph represent those of the *individuals* attending the seminar in which these discussions took place. They are *not* to be interpreted as representing any kind of official position on the part of either the AFL/CIO or the UAW. It is further important to emphasize the fact that, while every attempt has been made here to report participant views as they were actually expressed, the possibility of misunderstanding exists and must be recognized. The views expressed in this monograph, then, are most accurately pictured as what I *think* these participants were trying to tell me. If credit is due for the contents of this paper, it properly belongs to the participants. To whatever extent blame is to be assigned for inaccurate or misleading statements, that blame must be placed squarely on the Director, Office of Career Education–not on the participants themselves.

With these understandings, the contents of this paper have been developed around the seven major topics participants chose to discuss at length during the period of the seminar. These seven topics were chosen by the participants from a longer list of topics they developed at the beginning of the seminar. The complete listing of such topics appear as Appendix B of this paper. Names and titles of the participants appear as Appendix A.

In What Kinds of Career Education Activities Should Organized Labor Participate?

Career education advocates have talked too much about the necessity of involving organized labor in their efforts and too little about exactly what roles and functions can best be assumed by representatives from organized labor. It is past the optimal time for answering this question. It should have been addressed at the very beginning of the career education effort. Even now, it is not too late provided career education practitioners recognize the absolute necessity of listening to answers that persons representing organized labor give to this basic question.

In a generic way, organized labor seeks to become involved in career education in at least five basic areas including: (a) serving as curriculum consultants with respect to infusing views of organized labor into the total set

of career education concepts to be imparted to youth; (b) serving as career education resource persons in the classroom; (c) serving as consultants and participants in career education field trips carried out in the occupational society itself; (d) contributing to the developing philosophical and conceptual base of career education; and (e) serving as consultants to educators with respect to cooperative work experience and other forms of work experience activities carried out in the name of career education. Some of these topics are made into separate sections of this paper because of their importance. Others are also important, but finite enough in nature so as to be discussed here.

Different kinds of activities, on the part of organized labor representatives, are seen as appropriate at various levels of the K-12 school system in career education. At the K-6 level, organized labor can best contribute by providing role models for career awareness purposes. To have a real electrician, for example, come into an elementary school wearing his/her regular work clothes and carrying the tools of the electrician's trade can form the basis for a meaningful career education learning experience. When the electrician answers questions such as: "How do you help people?" "What is a typical day like for you on the job?" "How do you use reading, writing, and math skills in your work?" "What kinds of things do you like to do in your spare time?" and "Why did you decide to become an electrician?" it is a meaningful educational experience for elementary school pupils. They are better able to both: (a) understand and respect the importance of the electrician in our society; and (b) gain an understanding of why it is important for them to learn the basic academic skills taught in the elementary school. It is also a learning experience for the electrician who, through such interactions with young pupils, may find himself/herself thinking about the work of the electrician in even more positive ways than were possible before.

At the junior high school level, some of the key basic concepts involved in the "nuts and bolts" of organized labor operations can be communicated to students as part of career education efforts. It is certainly not too early to discuss with junior high school students general topics such as "What's it like to be a family whose breadwinner(s) is (are) on strike?" Neither is it too early for youth to be given the meaning of such basic concepts as those represented in terms such as: (a) collective bargaining; (b) arbitration; (c) minimum wage; or (d) workman's compensation. Organized labor has contributed much to making such concepts an integral part of American society and in willing to help junior high school youth understand and appreciate their true meanings. If such youth are to grow up to be responsible adult citizens, these understandings are essential.

Over and beyond this, organized labor could also help junior high school students better understand and appreciate the many kinds of community service activities in which organized labor is involved. Many do not, for example, either understand or appreciate the key role organized labor, in many communities, plays in operations of the United Fund. In addition, as part of the career exploration process at the junior high school level, organized labor can and will be willing to help students understand educational requirements necessary for gaining entry into occupations that are highly unionized. An often overlooked element of the occupational society is the large and growing number of persons who are today following careers in the organized labor movement itself. For example, three are over 600 such persons in the Akron, Ohio area alone at the present time. This part of the total occupational society could be made visible to junior high school youth through the involvement of representatives from organized labor.

At the senior high school level, it is important that students study and learn about the history, philosophy, structure, achievements, and goals of the American labor movement. To understand and appreciate the private enterprise system, as contrasted with economic systems operating in other parts of the world, it is essential that the story of organized labor be presented in terms of its history of evolution, its current status, and its role in making and keeping America strong. For high school students to know and understand similarities and differences in operation between the American labor movement and what serves as its counterparts in other parts of the world culture will certainly contribute to helping students better understand and appreciate America itself. While this content is seen as appropriate for all students, it is obviously most essential for those students who plan to enter the occupational society shortly after leaving high school. While a special emphasis may be needed for such students, it is essential that the basic content be made available to *all* high school youth.

In addition, organized labor is capable and willing to assist senior high schools in devising, administering, and validating competency measures in the skilled trades areas. Performance testing is rapidly gaining popularity in a variety of areas and is seen as particularly appropriate to apply in the skilled trades area. Representatives from organized labor can contribute more than simply advice and expertise with respect to performance testing in the skilled trades. As experts in knowing about the kinds of suffering people go through when they seek to enter the occupational society without necessary vocational skills, they are simultaneously aware of the benefits such skills provide as a basis for helping the individual play a more effective role as family member, and as citizen, in addition to one's role as worker.

In all of these areas, members of the American organized labor movement possess knowledge and expertise not present among many other members of society—including many educators. Persons from organized labor are willing to share their expertise with both educators and with students if they are asked to do so in proper ways and under proper conditions. We turn now to suggestions of seminar participants regarding some of these "proper ways" of involving members of organized labor.

How Should K-12 School System Obtain Resource Persons From Organized Labor?

If, in a given community, educators wish to involve the organized labor movement in the total career education collaborative effort, it is essential that they begin making contacts through the Central AFL/CIO Labor Council in that community. The temptation to begin with only one representative from one particular union—e.g., a member of the Graphics Arts International Union, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, etc—should be resisted. The AFL/CIO Central Labor Council, where one exists, is easily located in the local telephone directory. No other initial contacts with organized labor should be made until the possibility of going through the local Central AFL/CIO Labor Council has been attempted.

In some communities, of course, the situation exists where organized labor is dominated by a major union—e.g., United Auto Workers, United Mine Workers, etc.—that are not a formal part of the AFL/CIO structure. In such instances, contact should begin with that Union. In those communities where no strong organized labor effort exists, initial contacts may have to be made with, first the State AFL/CIO normally located in the State capital. If this contact produces no response, then write to the Education Department, AFL/CIO, in Washington, D.C. Such State or national contacts should not be attempted until attempts to make contacts at the local cummunity level have been exhausted.

There are three major kinds of union representatives that the local Central AFL/CIO Labor Council could conceivably assist in providing for a career education effort. First, they could, under appropriate arrangements, provide a pool of current apprentices to serve as role models for in-school youth who wish to investigate apprenticeship opportunities through organized labor. Because of recent significant movement on the part of the organized labor movement itself to reduce race and sex barriers to entering apprenticeship, it is entirely possible that the local Central AFL/CIO Labor Council could identify role models from the pool of current apprentices that may help school systems in their efforts to break down stereotypes. The use of actual apprentices

themselves is a very effective way of getting across to in-school youth the need for completing high school and for learning basic academic skills.

A second potentially valuable resource from organized labor would be to seek, through the efforts of the local Central AFL/CIO Labor Council, to involve retired journeymen union members as career education resource persons. Such persons have typically retained their ties with organized labor and are known to officials at the local Labor Council. They can play a valuable role in consulting with school officials about pre-apprenticeship testing procedures that are appropriate to use. On occasion, when used in this fashion, such persons have been effective in demonstrating to schools the need for curricular change that provides a greater emphasis on the importance of basic academic skills. In addition, of course, such retired persons can play an extremely valuable role in helping both youth and their teachers learn about the apprenticeship to journeymen route and something of the pride of workmanship exemplified by the journeymen union member.

The third potential resource, of course, consists of actual union members now employed. While this kind of resource should be sought and utilized to the greatest possible extent, educators must understand some of the practical problems faced by organized labor in providing this kind of resource. The major practical problem involved is that, in many communities, currently employed persons who are union members find themselves penalized, by loss of hourly wages, if they take time off from their jobs for purposes of serving as career education resource persons in school settings. This is a problem best resolved by working through the local Central AFL/CIO Labor Council to the local Community Career Education Action Council and then to individual employers of union members. If a particular industrial organization is willing to let management personnel leave their jobs for purposes of serving as career education resource persons in school settings, they should similarly be willing to make arrangements for members of organized labor in their organization to leave their jobs, with pay, in order to tell organized labor's side of the story. Too often, up until now, this has not been possible and, as a result, students in schools have been exposed primarily to only one side.

Underlying the use of any of these three kinds of possible resource persons from organized labor is the matter of costs associated with preparing them to participate effectively in career education and paying them for their activities when they are in a school setting. Participants reported that, in the case of retired journeymen, this problem has been solved, in some places, through using U.S. Department of Labor Title III CETA grant funds. It was the opinion of participants that such funds could also be used in the case of both apprentices and currently employed union workers, but this apparently has not yet been done—at least not to any significant degree. If educators responsible

for spearheading school career education efforts are successful in convincing the local Central AFL/CIO Labor Council to endorse and participate in career education, it is probable that the Council could work with local CETA prime sponsors in making some CETA funds available for these purposes. This again underscores the crucial importance of working through the local Central AFL/CIO Labor Council rather than through any single union or union member.

Organized Labor Representation on Community Career Education Action Councils

The implementation of career education, as a community collaborative effort, demands the presence and operation of some form of community council that can serve as an exchange of ideas, a formulator of policies to be suggested to the school board as well as to other segments of the community, and as a catalyst for broad community involvement in the total career education effort. Whether known simply as a "Career Education Advisory Council," a "Community Education/Work Council," or as a "Career Education Action Council," its essential functions will be of the same generic nature.

Those educators who have attempted to stimulate the development and operation of such Councils have, in the past, made several mistakes that seminar participants hope will be corrected. In the first place, representation from organized labor on the Council should consist of persons named from the local Central AFL/CIO Labor Council where such exists. If other significant parts of organized labor not represented in the AFL/CIO exist in a given community–e.g., Teamsters, United Mine Workers, United Auto Workers, etc.–each of these should also be represented on the Community Career Education Action Council. Where any of these exist, they can typically easily be located through simply using a telephone directory. The mistake to be avoided is to find one or more members of organized labor who are personally known to educators as persons sympathetic to the career education concept and asking such persons to "represent" organized labor on the Council. If organized labor is to truly be represented, then its representatives should be officially named by the local AFL/CIO Central Labor Council.

The second mistake some career education efforts have made is to think about membership on the Community Career Education Action Council in terms of the concept of the "business/labor/industry/professional/government community." When this is done–and "labor" is thought of as only one of five community segments, the voice of organized labor is obviously going to be a minority voice with the voice of management persons being in the majority. A good example of a community that has effectively solved this problem was seen in Montgomery County, Maryland where, the membership of the "Career

Education Advisory Council" consisted of 22 persons divided as follows: (a) five union representatives; (b) five business/industry representatives; (c) five educators; (d) two students; (e) two community based organizations; (f) one CETA representative; (g) one local government representative; and (h) one person representing special needs groups. The essential point to keep in mind is that the number of persons representing labor should be approximately the same as the number of persons representing the management side of the business/industry community.

The third mistake some career education efforts have made is to seek the involvement of organized labor on their advisory councils without having clearly in mind any specific ways in which they would like to involve organized labor in the total career education effort. Seminar participants emphasized strongly that, if educators aren't actually seeking the active involvement of organized labor in delivering career education, they should not simply engage in the "window dressing exercise" of asking representatives from organized labor to serve on the Career Education Action Council. Organized labor is willing to provide *help*, as well as *advice*, to educators in delivering career education, but not simply *advice alone*. This is a matter educators should decide before seeking to involve representatives from organized labor in the Council structure.

Some seminar participants voiced support for the concept of creating a special SCHOOL/LABOR RELATIONS ADVISORY COMMITTEE over and beyond any possible representation of organized labor on a Community Career Education Action Council. Their point was that organized labor has many concerns relative to education of where career education is but one. Many school administrators, like management personnel in other parts of society, are basically anti-union persons. Such school administrators need the advice and consultative assistance of organized labor on a wide variety of matters. It is possible to include advice and consultation on career education as one agenda item, but the total needed agenda extends considerably beyond career education. Other seminar participants felt that such a separate SCHOOL/LABOR RELATIONS ADVISORY COMMITTEE is not needed in their communities. The general consensus seemed to be that such a Committee should be considered as needed in some communities but not in others. One possible "middle" approach suggested was to create such a Committee as a sub-committee of the Community Career Education Action Council. To do so would have some obvious practical advantages but equally obvious conceptual disadvantages.

Involving Organized Labor On Career Education Field Trips

Most K-12 career education efforts involve extensive use of field trips on the part of educators and their students to the business/labor/industry community.

Seminar participants had several suggestions to make to educators with respect to how such field trip operations could be improved with reference to involving organized labor.

First, it is suggested that planning for the field trip involve organized labor as well as management personnel. Far too often, such field trips have been arranged through contacts between an educator and a person representing management in a particular business or industrial organization. It would be far better, where organized labor is represented in the business or industry to be visited, if one or more representatives from organized labor were involved along with management personnel and educators in planning the field trip. This can best be accomplished if educators will take the initiative by seeking consultative assistance from the local Central AFL/CIO Labor Council.

Second, it was suggested that field trips involve visits to the local union hall as well as to the business/industry site itself. It is extremely difficult for educators and their students to learn how a union operates simply by visiting a given plant location. An orientation field trip to the local union hall should properly precede actual plant visits in locations where organized labor activities exist. Such a visit could provide students and their teachers with written materials as well as oral presentations regarding union operations in sites to be visited.

Third, it was suggested that advice and consultation from representatives of organized labor is especially crucial in the case of those industries where problems of industrial safety exists. If, for example, a teacher wishes to take students on a field trip to a construction site to see how persons in this occupational cluster operate, it would be extremely helpful to seek the advice of the local construction unions prior to making contact with any management personnel. The organized labor representatives are in a position to advise educators where construction sites safe for field trips exist as well as about sites where it would be unsafe to conduct field trips. Armed with such advice, educators would then be in a much better position to contact construction firms themselves.

Finally, seminar participants urged educators to cease avoiding field trips to sites where organized labor is highly represented. Several pointed out that, in effect, this is what has been happening in many communities. It seems to be less trouble for educators to select, as field trip sites, business and industries where organized labor is not an important part of the operation. While this may be easier, it certainly is not better in terms of providing youth with realistic exposure to the occupational society.

As an example of a community where organized labor has been properly involved in the planning and actual conduct of student field trips in career education, seminar participants recommended that educators use Lima, Ohio. The arrangements in that career education effort were recommended for study and adoption by other educators.

Inservicing Educators With Reference To Organized Labor

It is obvious that, if educators are to effectively involve organized labor as a community resource in the effective delivery of career education, many educators need to learn much more about the American labor movement. A particularly strong example of a systematic effort to help educators learn more about organized labor can be seen in Akron, Ohio.

In Akron, through arrangements made between organized labor and the career education staff of the Akron public schools, representatives from organized labor have been invited to conduct special inservice meetings for teachers aimed at helping teachers learn more about the American labor movement. Such meetings are a planned, systematic part of the total inservice education program for educators in the Akron public schools. Voluntary attendance of teachers at such meetings has exceeded that for many other kinds of teacher inservice conducted in Akron.

In addition, the College of Education at the University of Akron has been conducting inservice education courses for university credit. Included in this effort is a seminar on "conflict resolution" in which representatives from organized labor and from management will, through simulation activities, demonstrate the entire negotiations process for educators enrolled in this course.

Currently, an extension of these efforts in Akron is being sought whereby a "labor resource center" will be established within the Akron Public Schools as an integral part of the career education resource center. Organized labor in Akron is contributing both materials and advice for this operation. In addition, it is hoped that organized labor will become involved in conducting a three week intensive inservice education program during the summer for 8-10 teachers interested in infusing materials from organized labor into the teaching/learning process. If the profit motive of the private enterprise system can be infused into the teaching/learning process—and it *is*—then surely basic information and concepts regarding organized labor can also be included in the infusion process. It can be seen that this Akron model envisions impacting on only a very small number of teachers as a beginning effort. This was felt to be much more advisable than attempting to involve the entire teaching staff, many of whom are sure to be far from ready for this kind of exposure. In Akron,

only teachers who voluntarily express an interest in this inservice education effort will be involved. This is, to be sure, a slow approach to solving the problem. A slow approach that produces positive and effective results was seen as preferable to a larger effort which, while having some PR benefits, will not result in effective results.

Seminar participants recognized the strong need currently existing with reference to specifying the curricular content that organized labor seeks to see infused into the total career education effort. In the absence of a specific project aimed at meeting this need, several suggestions were made regarding sources of information about organized labor readily available to educators. Such sources include:

1. AFL/CIO "Speaker's Manual"–(available from the local Central AFL/CIO Labor Council in many communities)

2. *Labor/Management Relationships*–published by the New York State Department of Education. (particularly appropriate for use in communities where organized labor is strong)

3. *Community, Labor, Management Relationships*–published by Delmar Publishing Company. (particularly valuable for use in those communities where strong organized labor doesn't exist).

4. AFL/CIO Film Catalogue–(available from the local Central AFL/CIO Labor Council in many communities)

5. *Teaching Guide For Labor History.* A publication of the American Federation of Teachers.

6. *AFL/CIO School Kit.* Available from the Education Department, AFL/CIO. (May also be obtained, in many communities, through the local Central AFL/CIO Labor Council)

7. *The Federationist.* A monthly journal published by the AFL/CIO that can be obtained on a subscription basis.

In addition, many individual unions publish a variety of materials that are available free, upon request, to educators for use in classroom settings. Those school systems encountering difficulty in securing AFL/CIO materials and/or feeling they need supplementary material on the American labor movement are urged to contact the Education Department, AFL/CIO, Washington, D.C.

Publications such as these, coupled with a plan that includes the basic concepts found in the Akron, Ohio setting, should help greatly in providing needed inservice education about the American labor movement. Seminar participants felt strongly that this process be thought of primarily in terms of actions at the local community level rather than any big national "push." By using an approach that builds on local "success examples," eventual progress will be made. Organized labor is not unwilling to invest some of its own resources in the total effort—especially those involving donations of time and personnel. However, it is unrealistic to expect that the organized labor movement can be expected to pay such inservice education costs, as, say, teacher stipends. Funds for such uses must come from other sources. The dues of union members must be largely reserved for use in activities more directly benefiting union members.

Work Experience In Career Education: Views Of Seminar Participants

No single aspect of career education is of more concern to organized labor than is the area of work experience. Seminar participants chose to devote a substantial portion of their time to discuss of this topic. Their observations and recommendations will be summarized here.

As general principles participants felt would be supported by organized labor, the following received special emphasis in this seminar:

1. Organized labor will adamantly oppose any form of work experience that either: (a) undermines the minimum wage; (b) displaces adult employed workers; or (c) undermines occupational safety and health laws and practices.

2. Community collaborative career education efforts involving work experience opportunities must, in no way, violate current collective bargaining agreements that exist in particular business or industrial organizations.

3. Educators should make at least as great an effort to find and utilize work experience sites in settings where organized labor exists as in settings where organized labor is not represented. The current tendency in many school systems to ignore work experience sites in places where organized labor exists is deplorable. It is a situation that should be corrected immediately.

4. The notion that the basic purpose of work experience, in career education, is anything but career exploration is untenable. This *is* its only valid basic purpose. Whether the work experience is paid or unpaid is not relevant to consideration of this basic principle.

5. Work experience, as part of American education, should represent an option available to all students, but a requirement for none.

6. Whether or not work experience, as part of career education, should be paid or unpaid depends on whether it is designed to be productive or non-productive activity. If productive, it should be paid at least the minimum wage under conditions that allow the youth to be integrated into the work force in ways that do not displace any adult employed worker.

Seminar participants emphasized they are *not* opposed to the generic concept of work experience being included in career education, but were concerned only about the manner in which it is to be provided. Several alternative forms of work experience were provided as examples of the kinds that might be considered acceptable to organized labor. Among such alternatives, the following specific examples were given:

1. Observational work experience that allows the youth to shadow and observe an employed worker without actually doing his/her work.

2. Work experience programs in which youth work in special facilities, not on the regular assembly line where they might displace adult employed workers. This kind of activity is acceptable provided its primary goal is seen as providing youth with training rather than actually producing products for employers.

3. Producing materials, in a simulated assembly line production setting, that are never intended to be sold. For example, one school did this using out-of-date dies supplied the school by a local plant. Students *were* engaged in productive work, but the products themselves were never sold.

4. Participating in productive work experience jointly supervised by labor and management. For example, the Texas AFL/CIO has participated in a house building project, as part of vocational education, where the houses are eventually sold.

5. Simulated work experience of various kinds. For example, many unions have such facilities that are used to train apprentices before they go out on real jobs. Such facilities could be used as simulation work experience centers for career education provided proper arrangements are made with the appropriate union through the local Central Labor Council.

6. Career exploration work experience opportunities. For example, if students spend two or three days, under the direct supervision of the regular worker, learning what it would be like to do that worker's job, it would be acceptable provided: (a) the student is not paid; and (b) the union worker continues to be paid his/her regular wages. Under these arrangements, students could be moved from occupation to occupation for purposes of exploring careers.

Members of this seminar were particularly opposed to the kind of work experience currently being introduced into several career education efforts in the general area of entrepreneurship. Such efforts typically involve the establishment and operation of various forms of small business enterprises by students themselves as profitmaking enterprises. Such activities were seen by these participants as representing work that should probably be done by adult workers thus helping to reduce the adult unemployment problem in the Nation. It was pointed out that, when this kind of activity was begun in California a few years ago, a State law was passed forbidding it. These seminar participants seemed to generally favor such State laws.

The problems associated with work experience vary greatly from State to State depending on State laws and from occupation to occupation depending on certain Federal laws. As examples of restrictions imposed by Federal law, it was noted that both the manufacturing and the mining industry are prohibited from employing any person under 18 years of age. As an example of conditions within a single State, it was pointed out that Michigan auto plants have ceased employing 17-year-olds because, to do so, would greatly increase their insurance rates. Most of the problems local schools face with respect to work experience were seen by participants as arising more from State than from Federal laws. For this reason, it is impossible to make up a single list of recommendations that will be strictly applicable at the local community level. For example, some States have mandated that, if students are to be engaged in work experience efforts operating under the supervision of school officials, schools must have insurance to cover such participating youth. In other States, no such requirements exist.

Several suggestions were offered that might expand the existence of work experience opportunities for youth. Some were as obvious as pointing out that there are now over 12 million illegal aliens in America who are taking jobs away from American youth and adults. This was of clear concern to some participants in this seminar. On a more action-possible level, participants expressed concern about the fact that, of all youth ages 16-19 in the Nation today (including both in-school and out-of-school youth) approximately 47 percent are employed on either a part-time or full-time basis. Some of the part-time employment situation could be legalized and cleaned up in ways that

would provide work experience opportunities for more students. For example, many in-school youth with work permits calling for a maximum of 20 hours per week of employment are actually working closer to 40 hours per week. Schools, except for students in cooperative work experience programs, have failed to accept any substantial monitoring or educational responsibility for in-school youth part-time job experiences. This was seen by participants as an area that could potentially be turned around by a comprehensive career education effort in ways that might not only benefit more youth but, in addition, make such work experience more of a learning opportunity.

Encouraging Organized Labor To Become More Involved In Career Education

There seems little doubt but that the American labor movement is more interested and involved in career education now than was true when the career education effort began. Examples of this are to be found by examining the 1977 AFL/CIO resolution on career education and contrasting that resolution with those passed by AFL/CIO in 1972 and in 1974. The 1977 resolution is much more positively inclined toward the concept of career education in spite of the fact that reservations are still apparent. Similarly, one could point to formal policy statements endorsing career education passed, in recent years, by both the United Auto Workers International Union and by the United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, and Plastic Workers of America. A third example can be seen if one recognizes that, while organized labor in the District of Columbia rejected career education four years ago, they have, during the 1977-78 school year, held four career education workshops for educators in response to requests from local schools. The atmosphere has definitely improved.

School systems seeking the active involvement of organized labor in career education efforts must, however, be aware of constraints that are bound to make such involvement a slower process than some would like it to be. The most practical constraint is found in the fact that, operationally, career education cannot be a top priority item on the agenda of labor union education personnel at any level. Positions for education personnel within organized labor, paid for by union members dues, exist *primarily* because of the need on the part of union members for training and upgrading. Labor union education personnel positions were not created because of any interest on the part of organized labor in working with K-12 school systems. The union member, whose dues are being used, in part, to pay the salaries of such union education personnel, has a right to expect that such personnel will put matters such as helping the union member clear up an education grievance he/she has than on working with school districts in career education efforts. If labor union education personnel work in career education, it is primarily because they volunteer to do so, not because this is a recognized part of their regular job

assignment. Their main job is to do what they can to provide upgrading educational opportunities for union members. Educators must recognize and appreciate this fact.

A second practical constraint is found in the great deal of autonomy that exists at the local level for local unions. Because, for example, the United Auto Workers has adopted a national career education policy in no way means that policy will be forced upon any UAW local affiliate. It is important to understand that, unlike management, top labor officials are elected by the membership. It all starts from the local, not from the national level. For this reason, the optimum route to take in getting organized labor more involved in career education will be to devote energies of career education practitioners at the local level in interacting with local labor union leaders. To simply push for more national policy statements on the part of various segments of organized labor is not the way to go.

Faced with this situation, we can expect to find, among organized labor, an uneven involvement in career education. If, in a given local community, the leadership of organized labor is opposed to career education, it is fruitless to plan for widespread involvement of organized labor in career education. Instead, efforts must be directed toward understanding the basis on which the local labor union leadership objects to career education and attempts to answer such objections. Progress is being made, in places, at the local level. For example, in Connecticut, five major local labor councils each now have one person assigned to career education–usually a member of the Board of the Central Labor Council. That person attends career education meetings in their local area.

Several alternative approaches can be used to convince local union leadership of the advisability of becoming involved in career education. The most direct approach is one that emphasizes the need for change in American Education along with the general directions for change being championed by career education. Organized labor knows full well how fruitless and frustrating it will be if American Education continues to provide school leavers only with rudimentary entry level vocational skills. The emphasis career education places on providing youth with employability skills that allow them to change with change in the occupational society will appeal to many labor union leaders.

A second approach that could be tried is one that emphasizes the fact that career education efforts, nationwide, continue to grow both in numbers and in terms of comprehensiveness of efforts. Career education is not, as some had thought, a simple "fad" that will be disappearing any time in the near future. Given the fact that this appears to be a growing and dynamic movement aimed

at basic educational change, it behooves organized labor to become a part of the total career education effort. This approach may appeal to some.

Third, participants suggested using an approach that emphasizes the positive potential of using the career education effort as a way of infusing knowledge, understanding, and appreciation of organized labor into the basic fabric of American Education. Viewed in this way, career education is seen as "opening the door" for the American labor movement in many schools where, in the past, contacts of a sustaining nature were difficult to generate.

Finally, it was suggested that local union leadership may be encouraged to become involved in career education as parents and as taxpayers. The public schools in any community are, on these bases alone, important to members of organized labor. Since career education's prime focus is on helping youth solve problems of education/work relationships and since these same problems are present among the children of many members of organized labor, it seems reasonable to assume that career education, explained in this fashion, may find some receptivity among local labor union leaders.

Participants in this seminar, while recognizing there is still much to be done before the active involvement of organized labor in career education efforts becomes commonplace at the local community level, were insistant on emphasizing that the resistance to career education found within organized labor is not the only place such resistance is seen. There is, to begin with, still a very great deal of resistance within the professional education community itself. With educators themselves remaining divided with respect to the virtues and faults of career education, it should not be surprising to find various segments of the broader community—including organized labor—being hesitant to endorse the career education concept on a widespread scale.

Advice To OE's Office of Career Education From Seminar Participants

In a very real sense, the entire contents of this paper can be viewed as consisting of advice to OE's Office of Career Education as well as to career education practitioners at the State and local level. Some specific action suggestions, however, were made to OCE that should be noted here.

First, participants recommended the publication of the monograph in which this paper is included. They felt that neither the Bommarito speech nor the Schulman paper had received sufficient publicity within the professional education community and were anxious to give both documents wider visibility. They viewed this monograph as an opportunity for doing so.

Second, they recommended that every effort be made to assure a minimum of two persons representing organized labor be appointed as members of the National Advisory Council For Career Education. During the time the NACCE has been in existence, there have been no formal representatives from organized labor appointed as members. Such appointments are made by the Secretary of HEW, and as of the time these words are being written, no official word has yet been received with respect to whether or not this recommendation will be followed.

Third, participants recommended that key education persons from organized labor based in the Washington, D.C. area band together to form an Ad Hoc Committee On Organized Labor for OE's Office of Career Education. Such a committee could function in both reacting to and suggesting projects for career education and in influencing national union policies regarding career education. As of the time these words are being written, no word has been received with respect to implementing this recommendation.

Finally, participants expressed support for career education involvement in the Youth Employment and Training Program portion of the new YEDPA legislation. They were especially enthusiastic about possibilities of a career education involvement in the "transition services" portion of this legislation which, among other things, provide for career awareness and exploration opportunities for secondary and postsecondary school youth. As part of this recommendation, participants also emphasized the fact that, at the local level, organized labor is represented on every CETA Prime Sponsor Manpower Advisory Council and could be influential in encouraging LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements reflecting a career education emphasis in agreements signed between prime sponsors and local school districts.

Commentary by Director, Office of Career Education

Up to this point, the contents of this paper have, hopefully, reflected the thoughts, opinions, and advice of the participants. Insofar as possible, my personal biases have been omitted from this discussion. This final section is, perhaps, an appropriate point in which to insert a few personal reactions.

First, I was tremendously impressed by the breadth and depth of knowledge these participants possessed regarding the career education concept and current career education practices. It was my distinct impression, after listening as carefully as possible for two full days, that the participants in this seminar were, in no way, unaware nor uninformed about career education. I am convinced that it is important to pay attention to their advice and suggestions.

Second, this seminar provided me with a very great deal of new knowledge regarding the American labor movement and the ways in which persons involved in that movement are thinking about career education. Because I found myself with so much to learn, it seems especially important that this paper be written so these kinds of learning can be shared with others in career education. I have a distinct impression that others in career education, like myself, have a considerable amount of new knowledge to be gained regarding organized labor in our Nation.

Third, I am convinced, after listening to these participants and reflecting on career education practices I have observed around the country, that there is substantial validity in the criticisms participants leveled against career education. While many exceptions can be found, there are many communities where we are "guilty as charged" of such practices as: (a) failing to emphasize the point of view of organized labor as much as we do the point of view of industrial management personnel; (b) failing to have adequate representation from organized labor on our career education action councils; (c) failing to work, at the community level, through the Central AFL/CIO Labor Council; and (d) failing to give adequate attention to field trip and work experience sites involving large concentrations of persons involved in the organized labor movement. I see little point in reacting to such charges in a defensive manner. Instead, it seems wiser to acknowledge that, in many places, these kinds of criticism are justified and that they call for changes in action on the part of educators involved in career education.

Fourth, as I look at the suggestions for change proposed by these participants, I can find none that appear to me to be unreasonable nor unattainable. True, the extent to which we will be able to adopt these suggestions will vary widely from community to community, but this was recognized by the participants when they made them. I very much hope that those reading this paper will seek ways of following these suggestions rather than excuses for failing to follow them.

Fifth, I find myself now worrying about how career education efforts can be implemented that will provide fair information regarding unorganized labor as well as organized labor to American youth. While I recognize and accept the challenge to acquaint youth with organized labor in America, I find myself worried about the fact that large segments of the American labor force are not organized into unions. Somehow, our total career education efforts must reflect a fair and unbiased set of facts to youth regarding the entire occupational society.

Sixth, I found myself wondering how business/industrial management personnel will react to these suggestions. The necessity for engaging in the art

of compromise in order to carry out the goals of collaboration in career education becomes more and more obvious. So, too, in my opinion does the need for creation and operation of some form of Community Career Education Action Council as a vehicle for use in the art of compromise. I am constantly impressed, as I listen to and learn from both persons in organized labor and persons in business/industry management positions, at how well they mastered the art of compromise. They seem to be much better at it than are many of us who have spent our working years as professional educators. I used to worry a great deal about the strikes I read about in the news media. I find myself now more often marveling at the fact that, in most instances of labor/management negotiation, settlements, not strikes, are the eventual outcome.

Representatives from organized labor and from the business/industry management section appear to be much more often in a conciliatory relationship than they do in an antagonistic relationship. If, in most of their dealings, they find ways to work together in a positive fashion, then surely, it seems to me, they ought to find ways of working together—and with educators—in conceptualizing, planning, and implementing community career education efforts. I am convinced that the potential positive power of organized labor, at the community level, for effectively participating in career education has, to date, been underutilized. I very much hope that this paper, along with the other two found in this monograph, will help correct this situation.

APPENDIX

Kenneth Edwards
International Brotherhood Union of
Electrical Workers
1125 - 15th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

Buford Holt
724 Smith Valley
Greenwood, Indiana 46124

Carroll Hutton
Director of Education
United Auto Workers
Solidarity House
8000 East Jefferson
Detroit, Michigan 48214

Robert Lent
711 West 13 Mile Road
Madison Heights, Michigan 48071

Al Lorente
3000 East Jefferson Avenue
Detroit, Michigan 48214

Harold O'Reilly
11340 Hammack Drive
Bridgeton, Missouri 63044

Camille Robinson
Amalgamated Clothing and Textile
Workers
99 University Place
New York, New York 10003

John Stagg
Graphics Arts International Union
1900 "L" Street, N.W., Suite 708
Washington, D.C. 20036

Robert Strauber
Educational Director
United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum and
Plastic Workers of America
87 South High Street
Akron, Ohio 44308

Joseph Uehlein
Industrial Union Departmen:
AFL-CIO
815 16th Street, N.W.
Washington,D.C. 20006

Jim Ward
AFT
11 Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

APPENDIX

Issues Raised by Participants

1. Where does career education fit into the whole educational process–the goals of Education?
2. Qualifications of teachers to do career education.
3. Danger of displacement of adult workers as a possible problem for career education.
4. How to improve communications among labor, education, business/industry and government?
5. How can the goals and philosophy of organized labor be infused into the content of career education?
6. Where is organized labor most needed in career education?
7. How can organized labor best participate in teacher inservice in career education?
8. How can organized labor best participate in *implementing* career education?
9. What is the role of organized labor on community career education advisory committees?
10. How can or should Federal policy affect local decisions in career education?
11. How can the benefits of unionized occupations best be made part of career development for youth?
12. How can media presentations be changed so as to bring more status to unionized occupations?
13. How can organized labor contribute best to the developing NOIC/SOIC system?
14. How can organized labor get more involved in developing high school curriculums in vocational education?
15. How can career education be operated in ways that avoid premature occupational choices or "pigeonholding?"
16. How can the focus of career education emphasize more the qualities of successful workers?
17. How can organized labor best collaborate with the schools unfiltered by also trying to collaborate with business and industry?
18. How can organized labor best work with Junior Achievement? With NAB? With NAIEC?

19. How can organized labor best participate in CETA youth programs related to career education?

20. How can career exploration be carried out in ways that still allow time to adequately cover academic subjects?

21. How can career exploration be done in ways that: (a) protect the minimum wage; and (b) doesn't displace adult workers?

22. How can union *volunteers* be expected to participate in community collaborative efforts when these consist of daytime meetings called by the Chamber of Commerce that cause union volunteers to lose wages by attending?

23. How do we get a clear notion of what career education really is?

24. Does "collaboration" in career education mean "domination" by business and industry?

88

APPENDIX

RESOLUTION NO. 20: EDUCATION IN GENERAL

16th IUE Constitutional Convention
Chicago, Illinois
September 9-13, 1974

UAW CAREER EDUCATION STATEMENT
January 1976

RESOLUTION NO. 43: EDUCATION AND WORK

Submitted by: AFT Executive Council
AFT Convention
August 1976

89

16th IUE Constitutional Convention
Chicago, Illinois
September 9-13, 1974

RESOLUTION No. 20

EDUCATION IN GENERAL

Every individual irrespective of class, sex or age should have the opportunity to acquire as much education as he desires in order to develop his full potential and thus play a meaningful role in society. Unfortunately, our educational system has failed in many ways to provide these opportunities:

1. It has failed to provide equal opportunities to our black, Spanish surnamed, Oriental, and Indian citizens.

2. It has failed to offer services to the poor which are equivalent to those offered people who are better off financially.

3. It has failed to eliminate functional illiteracy.

4. It has failed to provide adequate opportunities to our older citizens.

There are, however, some successes that we cannot overlook:

1. There is a trend towards democratization of educational opportunity.

2. Children have access to more years of education today than their parents received.

3. In higher education, about three times as many college-age youth are enrolled in institutions of higher learning as compared with enrollment prior to World War II.

4. A larger percentage of minority groups and working-class children are participating in higher education than ever before.

Fortunately, educational institutions are taking a deeper interest and involvement in the society as a whole. Throughout the country, community colleges have been setting up associate degree programs in Labor Studies. About 30 colleges and universities have extension programs to help train and educate union leaders and members.

Unions continue to operate in many ways to make additional educational opportunities possible for workers. Through the use of the tuition refund promising now in many IUE agreements, workers have an opportunity to expand their skills on the job, and more important are able to acquire knowledge in subjects and fields necessary to move ahead in their chosen occupation.

As in no other period of human history, we are living in a period of rapid change. Knowledge and skills we acquire must be updated to be useful to the lives of our children.

We have been hearing a great deal recently about career education. Unfortunately, this concept is not clear but if it is to be successful it must relate career alternatives to the ongoing changes in our society and offer students realistic options.

As trade unionists, we must be informed of and take great interest in the educational proposals and innovations that continue to come on the scene.

Unfortunately, the Nixon Administration did little to carry out this nation's commitment to quality and equality in education. The Right to Read campaign is under-financed at a time when, according to the National Reading Council, more than 18 million Americans, aged 16 and over, cannot read well enough to function in society.

Our public libraries are being starved for funds and must curtail their programs.

Funds for career education approved by the Nixon Administration are being transferred from the Vocational Education Act and the Higher Education Act.

These are only a few of the obstacles to fulfilling the educational needs of our country.

In addition, the busing issue continues to divert time and attention from the basic issues of correcting the flaws of our educational system. By margins of only one or two votes the Senate in late May defeated attempts to block further school desegretation. It is ironic that the new attack on desegregation came almost on the eve of the 20th anniversary of the Supreme Court's *Brown* decision.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

1. That America's priorities be reordered so that educational needs take precedence over all other demands.

2. That the IUE support the Women's Educational Equality Act which provides grants to develop non-sexist curriculum, non-discriminatory vocational and career counseling, sports education, and other such programs.

3. That sexism and racism, in every form, be removed from our educational system.

4. That the concept of progressive learning in "schools without walls" and similar educational innovations be encouraged.

5. That the IUE continue its fight for direct Federal funding of the schools in this country in place of the obsolete and inadequate property tax and sales tax for school support.

6. That funding for vocational and adult education be increased, noting, however, that a complete vocational technical education should include all that is relevant in general education curriculum in addition to occupational skills and knowledge that are saleable in the marketplace.

7. That the IUE together with the rest of the labor movement, continue to fight for increased funds for land-grant colleges and other higher educational institutions.

8. That the IUE support a program of 16 years of free public education for every young person—to be used in academic, technical or vocational training, including adequate supportive services in career guidance and counseling to ensure that every American achieves his full potential.

9. That the IUE recommend renewed local, State and Federal efforts not only to end school segregation but to ensure that the schools will be meeting places for children of all races, ethnic backgrounds and economic means.

10. That the IUE support democracy in education which brings to the process of educational decision all who are involved in the process: students, teachers, parents and the community at large.

January 1976

UAW CAREER EDUCATION STATEMENT

In recent months career education has blossomed on the education scene. Career education is a concept and educational delivery system designed to provide a learning vehicle so *every* student involved in the public education process will acquire basic skills, prepare for social participation and change, think creatively and critically, develop a strong self-concept, and learn vocational, technical and academic skills. Preparing young people for their roles as workers in the occupational field is an important part of the career education concept. It is also the type of education which should equip all students to perform effectively and contribute constructively to society.

Career education is a response to the call for educational reform of a system which has failed to respond viably to the educational needs of today's society. The UAW, along with other labor organizations, participated in the development of this reform.

The call for educational reform is a reaction to the many problems with conventional public education which have surfaced. Factors identified with these problems include:

- The low performance levels of graduating students, necessitating extensive remedial education.
- Education has not been related to actual living experiences.
- Public education fails some two and one-half million students annually. These are identified as high school dropouts, college dropouts, and students in the general education track.
- Students making the transition to a post-school environment face frustrating experiences, demonstrated by inability to relate effectively to the complexities of community and family structures.
- Failure to provide quality education to minority and economically disadvantaged students.
- Current public education stresses teaching rather than learning.
- Disproportionate emphasis toward college preparatory curriculums when compared to the actual need for baccalaureate degrees in today's job market.

- Failure of students to acquire and possess vocational, technical and academic skills.

- Functional illiteracy still prevails among more than 20 million adults.

- Lack of easy-access, easy-exit educational opportunities for adults and older citizens, with emphasis on life-long continuing education.

Career education, properly implemented, addresses itself to correction of these problems.

The UAW views a person's career as his or her whole lifetime, which includes the various life roles experienced by our populace. With little exception, all persons will be students, family members, and citizens, as well as workers. Career education relates to each of these life roles. Students must learn how to learn. This will provide the adaptability competencies necessitated by changing job conditions. Current statistics indicate the average person will change jobs some six times during a lifetime. New skills may be required along with refurbishing of old talents.

Substantial numbers of students in many schools are channeled into the so-called general curriculums. These curriculums are not geared to any special end result except graduation. Following graduation, these students have neither the ability to acquire entry-level jobs, nor the ability to absorb post-secondary education. Career education provides for acquisition of saleable skills by high school graduates who are not college-bound.

While part of the concept of career education provides that education should be preparation for work, the entire concept also stresses that public education must accomplish other things. Even though work is an important aspect of one's career, it does not represent the totality of lifetime. Cultural, aesthetic, and leisure-time activities must be considered. Earning a living is not the same as living a rich and rewarding life. The skills required to understand and cope with the problems of our culture and society must also be taught, as well as the skills to bring about those constructive changes a viable society constantly needs.

Development of the career education philosophy has been intensified by passage of legislation to promote it. The Federal career education statute became law in August 1974. Currently, 19 States have either passed or are considering passage of career education legislation. But career education does not occur in a vacuum. Our intolerably high unemployment rate foreshadows the doom of any career education program. It seems clear that career education can only become meaningful when there are decent jobs available for everyone

seeking work. Full employment is a fundamental need, and we need the national commitment to achieve this goal.

Career education is expected to create a citizen who is self-confident and culturally advanced; one who relates well to others, adapts to change, possesses both living skills and job skills, and who can manage the tools of his or her occupation. The UAW endorses the career education philosophy, and is wiliing to work with educators and others toward its successful implementation.

RESOLUTION NO. 43

Education And Work

Submitted by: AFT Executive Council

August 1976

AFT
Convention

Comprehensive public education is the cornerstone of American democracy. Open access to an education that provides breadth of learning, depth of understanding and equal opportunity should be the right of every child and adult. Education programs which enlarge the learning experience have the effect of increasing opportunities for students and expanding their life choices. Education and work programs should also cause this result. The effect of such programs should be to raise aspirations and increase prospects for upward mobility.

The American Federation of Teachers believes that the purposes of education are both broad and varied. While an adequate education should provide students with the general intellectual skills to begin pursuing a variety of careers, career orientation is only part of this larger function. Education must prepare students to enrich themselves throughout their lifetimes. It must enable them to function as citizens who make basic economic, political and social choices well beyond the choice of a job. There is no such thing as being "overeducated." Job performance alone should never provide the total measure of the value of an education.

The efforts to relate education to job preparation are commendable. But they should not be built on false assumptions. High unemployment is not a result of educational failure. Those concerned with unemployment should look first to economic and job policies to solve unemployment problems. These

might include support for public works and other job creating programs, tax policies which stimulate the economy, Federal support for housing and construction programs, and an expanded Federal role for education, health and welfare services, among others. As part of the AFL-CIO, the AFT recognizes that economic problems need economic solutions. The education sector should never accept blame for a youth unemployment problem it did not create.

The idea that there is need for a closer relationship between schooling and job preparation has recently grown in popularity. "Education and work," as the concept is termed, may refer to a broad range of programs including "career education," "lifelong," "recurrent," "continuing," and even "competency-based" education. In recognizing the potential misdirection of some well-intentioned education and work programs, the American Federation of Teachers urges locals and state federations to participate in the development of such programs and adopts the following guidelines with regard to their implementation:

- Expanded guidance and counseling services must be provided to all students. Career education programs which offer additional guidance—which expand upon the basic curriculum and which are aimed at career awareness—should be supported. Teachers may wish to use job resource persons in these programs, but such persons should be chosen by the teacher, and be under his or her supervision. Non-professionals should not be used in professional roles. Such programs should include accurate treatment of the role of labor unions and should deal with unions as well as employers in making job placements. In fact, such placement services should be expanded.

- Alternative programs which have a career orientation may be provided for students who cannot function in, or who do not obtain benefit from, regular school programs. While some of these may involve work experience, they must be carefully constructed so that they are clearly the responsibility of the public school system and are aimed at broadening rather than narrowing youth's educational experience.

- Where career education programs involve any kind of experience at the job site they should be tried only in industries where there is full employment and where no adult workers will be displaced. These programs must supplement a basic education and not act as a substitute for it.

- The AFT will resist the creation of programs which involve watering down child labor laws, providing for subminimum wages, lowering the school-leaving age, or weakening health and safety laws related to work.

• The AFT strongly opposes career education programs that involve turning over some of the responsibility for public education to the private sector. Cooperative "education and work" community councils should in no way undermine the authority of publicly elected or appointed school boards. We oppose voucher plans that would subject both education and its consumers to the whims and prejudices of the marketplace.

The American Federation of Teachers believes that the most hopeful education and work programs have not yet been tried and urges those already involved in career education—as well as many others who may recognize the importance of expanded adult opportunities—to support the following proposals:

• Job training programs which build upon a basic education by combining further academic experiences with on-the-job experiences should be expanded. These might include internship programs for teachers, career ladder programs for paraprofessionals and others as well as apprenticeship programs.

• More information should be made available on job availability, occupational projections, job access, etc. Information which is available should be compiled and disseminated in some useful form.

• Adult education programs must be expanded. Such programs should service all adult educational needs whether they be for job training or retraining or for personal enrichment. They may take the form of worker sabbaticals, paid educational leave, deferred educational opportunity and the like. Programs that provide workers with recognized credentials should be available to them. Programs now offered by institutions of higher education that provide for career training should not be cut simply because they are expensive.

• Restrictions against the use of public schools by adults must be reexamined. Special programs which allow adults to return to school to complete a high school program should be implemented.

GPO 932-630

97 *U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1979 0-622-950/